



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

☐ Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » 2007 KingStat



**DNRP**

**KingStat**

Improving Government  
Service and Performance

**2007**



| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |

## Welcome to KingStat 2007

July 1, 2008

For many years, the Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP) has used performance information to enhance service delivery, improve program effectiveness and maintain accountability to the public.

We track changes in environmental and community conditions (referred to as "indicators") and reports on our agency's performance in achieving stated goals and targets (referred to as "performance measures").

In 2007, we began posting our performance reports on-line as a way to gather feedback from residents, ratepayers and employees on the effectiveness of the programs DNRP delivers. We also began measuring the equity of service delivery in major program areas in support of the King County Equity and Social Justice Initiative. We evaluated parks and trails, water quality, hazardous waste management and wastewater and solid waste facility locations to identify any disproportionate benefits and burdens that could be addressed through program adjustments or reprioritizations.

We are proud of our success in measuring the impact that our programs are having on the environment and our community — from protecting Puget Sound and providing youth recreation to encouraging resource conservation and reuse. Our goal is to more accurately target our resources to known areas of concern. This approach involves a commitment of resources to monitor water quality, measure forest cover, and track the health of people and the environment.

We have prioritized our scientific and analytical resources to better understanding three primary objectives:

- Effectiveness at achieving results and improving conditions;
- Efficiency of program operations and resource utilization; and
- Fairness and equity of how benefits and burdens are distributed throughout our services areas.

Our performance management challenges for 2008 include:

- Better decision support and performance measurements for capital investments, including parks, infrastructures and buildings;
- More robust assessments of the equity and social justice impacts of planning and policy decisions; and
- Enhancing management capabilities by extending the KingStat performance management process throughout our agency.



**Theresa Jennings**  
DNRP Director

Flash

Visual representation of  
DNRP's KingStat  
Program

DNRP Equity

King County AIMs High

### Previous Reports

2006 KingStat

2005 Measuring for  
Results  
- 7meg PDF

2004 Measuring for  
Results  
- 4.4meg PDF


2003 Measuring for  
Results  
- 4.3meg PDF

### News

King County  
performance reporting  
wins national awards

DNRP is striving hard to improve its performance information and to involve residents, businesses, partner agencies and other stakeholders in achieving our goal of sustainable, livable communities and a healthy environment.

Thank you for your interest in and contributions toward improved health of our community and environment. We look forward to your feedback.



Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

SEARCH  
Search this section


You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » Sitemap



## HOW ARE WE DOING? - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |

### Preliminary Findings: 2007 CONDITION INDICATORS & DNRP PERFORMANCE RESULTS BY GOAL AREAS



Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County





King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

**SEARCH**  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » Environmental Indicators



## COMMUNITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE


| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |

### DNRP 2007 COMMUNITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS

In simplest terms, indicators are measures of environmental conditions, while performance measures show how DNRP is doing at improving these conditions.

In practice, however, there is not always a clear line between measures that are environmental indicators and those that are measuring our agency's performance.

DNRP distinguishes between environmental indicators and performance measures based on the degree of our influence — measures that have many contributing factors are included as indicators, while measures that are strongly influenced by DNRP policies, programs, and practices are considered performance measures.



### Indicators

DNRP KingStat environmental indicators are summarized in five groups:

- [Aquatic Environment](#)
- [Land & Resources](#)
- [Health & Safety](#)
- [Resource Consumption](#)
- [Atmosphere](#)

The pie chart at the top of each indicator page provides a high-level summary of that indicator's condition. Readers will find more detailed information on environmental conditions by reviewing the various component measures, while information on how the data is collected can be found at the bottom of the page in "Technical Notes."

Information about these environmental indicators use a simple red/yellow/green/gray designation, where:

- Green signifies meeting or exceeding an adopted standard, a stated goal, or improved from prior years;
- Yellow signifies approaching to within 10 percent of an adopted standard, stated goal or has remained steady with prior years;
- Red signifies being below the standard or goal, or declining from prior years; and
- Gray signifies insufficient data at this time.

### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

#### At Home

Puget Sound Shoreline Stewardship Guidebook


Embrace Natural Yard Care

### Related Information

King County Ecological Lands

# DNRP 2007 ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS

## ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS



### INDICATORS KEY

- Meets or exceeds standard, goal, or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard, goal, or steady with prior years
- Below standard, goal or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

## Technical Notes

⊕ For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County

Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
☐ Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » Aquatic Environment



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                      |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources     | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Fresh Water Quality      | Marine Water Quality | Aquatic Biota   | Water Quantity       | Shorelines | Sediment Quality       |                       |                         |                  |

### AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT

#### Indicator

King County's Aquatic Environment Index includes information about the conditions of water quality, aquatic biota, shorelines, water quantity, and sediment quality. Our weighting system for overall aquatic environment condition includes:

- 45 percent water quality
- 25 percent aquatic biota
- 10 percent water quantity
- 10 percent shorelines, and
- 10 percent sediment quality

#### Status

Overall, conditions are below standard, with a few areas of lesser concern.

#### Influencing factors


Over the past two centuries, increased population and development have substantially altered King County's landscape. Less forests and natural land cover increase the need for engineered stormwater controls and reduce the amount of habitat for animal and plant species. Development and deteriorating water quality impact wildlife habitat — particularly the amounts of hard or paved surfaces, loss of tree cover and other changes to natural environments. Phosphorus from blended stormwater and wastewater that bypasses the treatment process during significant storm events, failing septic systems, pet wastes and water bird droppings reduce dissolved oxygen levels and increase water temperatures. Marine habitat quality is reduced by non-point source pollution, contaminated sediments and the high percentage of shoreline that has been armored with bulkheads and other structures.

#### What you can do

- Reduce your driving and reliance on cars -- drippings and exhaust from vehicles and run-off from roads and parking lots are primary contributors of water quality declines.
- Properly dispose of harmful chemicals, including unused pharmaceuticals and latex paints, instead of pouring them down the drain or allowing them to run off on the ground.
- Minimize the use of fertilizers and pesticides by practicing natural yard care.
- Wash your car on the grass or gravel instead of on the street or driveway, or take it to a car wash.
- Properly dispose of or manage pet and livestock wastes.
- Consider alternatives to bulkheads and other artificial barriers to marine shorelines.
- Plant trees and reduce impervious surfaces by using pervious pavers in drive and walkways.
- Encourage your local city or town to make tree protection regulations stronger.

#### 2007 Rating

##### Aquatic Environment Components



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Puget Sound Shoreline Stewardship Guidebook

Shoreline Practices for a Healthy Lake, River or Stream

Duwamish River Cleanup Coalition

##### At Work

Reduce your runoff, get a fee discount

Learn Best Practices to reduce Stormwater Pollution

Understand Industrial Waste Discharge Limits

#### Related Information

[Puget Sound Marine Topics](#)

[Puget Sound Watershed](#)

[Vashon Island Environmental Information](#)

[Puget Sound Partnership Recommendations](#)

[EPA: Lower Duwamish Watershed](#)

[Scientist Concerned For Puget Sound](#)

[A Comprehensive Assessment of the Central Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem](#)

- Contact your elected officials and express how important wildlife protections are to you—including salmon restoration.

More information about King County's Aquatic Environment Index is available by continuing to the following links for these measures:

More information about King County's Freshwater and Marine Water Quality is available by continuing below for these measures:

- [Water Quality - Freshwater Environment](#)
- [Water Quality - Marine Environment](#)
- [Aquatic Biota](#)
- [Water Quantity](#)
- [Shorelines](#)
- [Sediment Quality](#)

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

**Updated: December 18, 2008**

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County





King County  
Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

SEARCH  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Aquatic Environment](#) » Fresh Water Quality



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                      |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources     | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Fresh Water Quality      | Marine Water Quality | Aquatic Biota   | Water Quantity       | Shorelines | Sediment Quality       |                       |                         |                  |

### FRESHWATER WATER QUALITY

2007 Rating:

#### Freshwater Environment

**About this indicator:** King County's Freshwater Water Quality Index is derived from two main groupings of results describing the conditions of lakes and rivers & streams. Wetland conditions do not factor into the index at this time because of inadequate data. Our weighting system applies 65 percent to lakes, 30 percent to rivers and streams, and 5 percent to groundwater toward the overall freshwater water quality. Within the lakes index, our weighting system applies 70 percent to large lakes and 30 percent to small lakes toward the overall lakes indicator.

**Status:** Overall below standard, though with some areas of lesser concern.

**Influencing factors:** The impacts of development, landowner practices in areas close to the shoreline and pollutants are the dominant drivers determining the health of freshwater bodies in King County. Less forest cover and increases in impervious surfaces result in higher stream temperatures and more urban runoff. Phosphorus from blended stormwater and wastewater that bypasses the treatment process during significant storm events, failing septic systems, pet wastes and water bird droppings reduce dissolved oxygen levels and increase water temperatures.


#### What you can do:

- Properly dispose of unused pharmaceuticals, harmful chemicals and paints, instead of pouring them down the drain or allowing them to run off on the ground.
- Minimize the use of fertilizers and pesticides by practicing natural yard care.
- Wash your car on the grass or gravel instead of on the street or driveway, or take it to a car wash.
- Properly dispose of or manage pet and livestock wastes.


More information about King County's Freshwater Lakes and Streams is available by continuing below for these measures:

- [Phosphorus in Large Lakes](#)
- [Fecal Bacteria at Large Lakes Non-Swimming Beaches \(ambient\)](#)

#### Water Quality Components



#### Freshwater Environment - Water Quality Components



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Puget Sound Shoreline Stewardship Guidebook

Shoreline Practices for a Healthy Lake, River or Stream

##### At Work

Reduce your runoff, get a fee discount

Learn Best Practices to reduce Stormwater Pollution

Understand Industrial Waste Discharge Limits

#### Related Information

Puget Sound Marine Topics

Puget Sound Watershed

Vashon Island Environmental Information

King County marine research vessel "Liberty"

Hood Canal Marine Life Struggling for Oxygen

Lower Duwamish Watershed

Marine Benthic Invertebrate Communities Near King County Wastewater Outfalls

Water and Land Resources Division

- [Phosphorus in Small Lakes](#)
- [Streams Water Quality Index](#)
- [Nitrates in Groundwater on Vashon-Maury Islands](#)

## Phosphorus in Large Lakes

**About this measure:** The people of King County have made significant investments in water quality improvement and protection to lakes Washington, Sammamish and Union beginning with the diversion of wastewater effluent out of Lake Washington and Lake Sammamish in 1968.

Water quality improvements continue with efforts to:

- Reduce the discharge of combined sewer overflows
- Improve King County's wastewater treatment system (including construction of Brightwater treatment facility)
- Expand effluent reuse programs

These gains in water quality are constantly threatened by increasing amounts of phosphorus entering the watersheds as a result of increased development.

**Status:** Lake water quality results vary annually, depending on the climate and biological interactions that combine to create unique annual conditions in each lake. For example, the 1994-2007 results for Lakes Sammamish and Washington show phosphorus concentrations fluctuated between low to moderate threshold from year to year, indicating water quality varies from good to moderate with low potential for nuisance algal blooms. Lake Union typically has phosphorus concentrations within the moderate water quality range, with the exception of 2007. In 2007 high phosphorus levels put Lake Union in the poor water quality range.


Lake Sammamish is the only one of the three lakes with a management plan and designated water quality goals. The plan calls for an annual volume weighted total phosphorus concentration (VWTP) of 22 µg/L or less. Both the north and south lake stations met this goal in 2007 with a VWTP of 19 µg/L and 18 µg/L, respectively.

**Influencing factors:** In this region, phosphorus is most often the nutrient that promotes algal growth. The more phosphorus that can be stopped from entering lakes, the less chance that a potentially toxic cyanobacteria bloom will occur. Phosphorus can be managed through well-designed drainage systems, maintenance of sewer infrastructure, changing homeowner and business behaviors (to use no phosphorus fertilizers on lawns), education and incentives, and replacing watershed septic systems with sewers.

**Existing DNRP response:** King County will continue to monitor these lakes as part of its ongoing, Major Lakes Ambient Monitoring Program. This program is designed to track how lakes respond over time to various activities and inputs from the watersheds through influent streams, lake nutrient cycles, ecological interactions, and seasonal or year-to-year variability in weather. The goal of 100 percent of the three major lakes being within the range of moderate to low risk of potential algal blooms was met in lakes Sammamish and Washington, but was not met in Lake Union due to high phosphorus concentrations. If the lakes begin to show serious deterioration in terms of their beneficial uses, actions will be taken to further investigate causes and plans will be made.

**Priority new actions:** Continual changes to data analysis and Web site reporting will provide current and accessible information for the management of these resources.

**Major lakes Total Phosphorus Tropic State Index and the potential for nuisance algal blooms**




## Fecal Bacteria at Large Lakes Non-Swimming Beaches (ambient)

**About this indicator:** The presence of fecal bacteria in waterbodies indicates potential contamination with the fecal material from humans, birds or other animals. Fecal coliform bacteria is not a perfect indicator of sewage pollution because it can come from household or farm animals, wildlife, as well as untreated wastewater effluent and failing septic systems.

Although these bacteria are usually not harmful, they often co-occur with disease-causing pathogens, so their presence at high levels indicates an increased probability that people are at risk of becoming sick if they come into contact with the water. The lake standard for fecal coliform bacteria addresses human safety due to direct contact with the water from activities such as swimming and wading. Sites used for this indicator are located in both mid-lake (open water) and nearshore locations in King County's three largest lakes — Washington, Sammamish and Union. This environmental indicator is based on data collected at the routine monitoring sites and does not include sampling done in conjunction with emergency sewer overflow events.

**Percent non-swimming beach sites that meet the fecal coliform standards**




**Status:** Even though this measure uses a standard that is exceptionally difficult to attain, 100 percent of the Lake Sammamish stations, 85 percent of Lake Washington stations, and 60 percent of Lake Union stations have achieved the lake standard for fecal coliform bacteria. Lake Washington showed a decrease in samples meeting the standard from 2006, due to two high concentrations at station 0829 in addition to two high values measured at station 4903. Lake Union also showed a decrease due to high concentrations measured at stations 0512 and 0518.

**Influencing factors:** Six of the 11 samples that had fecal coliform greater than 100 CFU were the result of unusual storm conditions with the highest bacteria concentrations collected directly after record rainfall swept through the region the first week of January 2007. Lower percentages are attributed to the influence of combined sewer overflow (stations 4903, 0512, 0518) and stormwater outfalls into the lake. There are no CSO's that discharge into Lake Sammamish, five that discharge into Lake Washington and seven that discharge into the much smaller Lake Union. Additionally, the City of Seattle has 38 CSO's that discharge along the west side of Lake Washington and into Lake Union and the Ship Canal.

**Existing DNRP response:** DNRP will continue its extensive monitoring efforts to detect existing and potential problems with the stormwater and wastewater treatment system. In addition, King County's Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) program is employing various ways to control CSO's including controlling pollution at its sources, optimizing flow management, monitoring and modeling flows in the system and constructing CSO control facilities. To protect public health, King County has scheduled to control CSO's, beginning with construction of CSO control projects along Puget Sound beaches (2010-2011) and the east end of the Lake Washington Ship Canal (2015). The final phase of projects will be built along the Duwamish River (2017-2027) and the west end of the Ship Canal (2029-2030).

**Priority new actions:** King County expects to build about 20 Combined Sewage Overflow control projects during the next 30 years.




#### Fecal Bacteria at Large Lakes Non-Swimming Beaches (ambient)

2007 Findings

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

**About this indicator:** DNRP's goal is to maintain all beneficial uses of county lakes. In this region, high concentrations of the nutrient phosphorus are often correlated with increased algal growth. Thus, if the amount of phosphorus entering lakes is controlled or reduced, algal blooms are likely to decrease. Algal blooms are a nuisance because they can cause scum to form on the lake's surface and occasionally give a foul odor and taste to the water. When a bloom dies off it can also deplete the oxygen levels available to other aquatic life. In rare circumstances, algal blooms can become toxic.




Phosphorus concentrations in lake water as an indicator assess the potential for nuisance or toxic algal blooms that impact lakes, facilitating allocation of limited county resources toward restoring lakes with indications of serious degradation. This indicator uses summer phosphorus concentrations converted to Trophic State Indicators (TSI-TP) to assess conditions. Trophic State Indicators relate phosphorus to the amount of algae that the lake can support. Values below 50 have low or moderate potential for nuisance algal blooms; values above 50 have a higher potential.

**Status:** This indicator incorporates data from 31 of the lakes monitored by King County. Slightly more than 80 percent of the lakes have good water quality with low potential for nuisance algal blooms.

**Influencing factors:** Lake water quality varies annually and is affected by many site-specific factors. Phosphorus can be managed through drainage system design, improved sewer service, and encouraging homeowners through education and incentives to use best management practices. Although large amounts of algae may relate to changes in conditions, this increased presence may not always reduce beneficial uses. However, a trend in a particular lake toward increased TSI-TP over time is probably due to changes in the watershed and cannot be discounted.

**Existing DNRP response:** We continue to monitor the managed lakes and implement elements of the Lake Management Plans under county jurisdiction, with community support, as funds become available.

**Priority new actions:** Lake management plans will be considered if any other county lakes begin to show serious deterioration in terms of beneficial uses. Monitoring data will be available online beginning in mid-2007.



## Phosphorus in Small Lakes

2007 Findings

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

## Streams Water Quality Index


**About this indicator:** King County's Water Quality Index integrates key factors into a single number that can be compared over time and across locations. This index is based on the Oregon Water Quality Index and work done by the Washington Department of Ecology. From 2000 through 2007, 56 sites in the Lake Washington and Green-Duwanish drainage basins were sampled monthly for temperature, pH, fecal coliform bacteria, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, total suspended solids, and nutrients (phosphorus and nitrogen) relative to state standards and guidelines.

**Status:** Of the total sampled stream sites, 45 percent were considered moderate to high water quality, and 55 percent were rated to be of high concern. All sites rated of high concern were impacted in part by excessive nitrogen and/or phosphorus. In addition almost all high concern sites were affected by high fecal coliform bacteria (97 percent), low dissolved oxygen (74 percent), high temperatures (58 percent), and high-suspended solids/turbidity (32 percent).

**Influencing factors:** Overall stream water quality in King County is impacted by increased development in our region — primarily stormwater runoff. In 2006-07, cumulative rainfall was well above average compared to historical values, in part due to a very wet November and December.

Stormwater, combined sewer overflows (CSO's), waterfowl and pet wastes are the most likely sources of bacteria in urban streams. Poor livestock manure management and failing septic systems

## Percent stream stations in WRIA 8 & 9 with low to moderate concern WQI ratings






can be a potential source of bacteria in agricultural and suburban areas. In wetlands, wildlife excrement and stagnant water conditions can lead to elevated bacteria counts. High phosphorus concentrations are found in fecal material and elevated concentrations are often linked to similar sources as bacteria. In addition, elevated phosphorus concentrations are linked to areas undergoing development.

Low dissolved oxygen concentrations can be associated with low flows, wetlands, high temperatures (colder water holds more oxygen), and high levels of organic matter (bacteria use up oxygen in the process of decomposing).

**Existing DNRP response:** King County is responsible for preserving water quality and preventing and repairing damage to its waterways and water bodies. Attention is given to high concern sites to improve water quality. This can involve properly maintaining facilities, constructing or engineering solutions, identifying where or how pollutants are entering the stream, and/or educating adjacent property owners about the impacts of pesticides and fertilizers on streams.

**Priority new actions:** Results from King County's Water Quality Index highlight the need for a comprehensive and coordinated approach to resolving in-stream flow management, since lower summer flows and increased stormwater runoff inflate every water quality measurement of the index. King County will work with the Puget Sound Partnership to advocate a coordinated effort in the planning at a regional scale.



#### Streams Water Quality Index

2007 Findings

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

### Nitrates in Groundwater on Vashon-Maury Islands

**About this indicator:** King County has been tracking groundwater quality on Vashon-Maury Island since 2001. Nitrate is used to track groundwater quality because it is a good indicator of changes caused by human activities, such as land-use development. King County's goal is to ensure high water quality through effective land-use and on-site septic regulations.

The groundwater quality indicator uses a nitrate index, defined as the maximum concentration of


the annual sampling results divided by the maximum contaminant level (MCL) of Nitrate (10 mg/L). This method yields one number. The closer this index gets to 1 (or over 1) the greater concern. The nitrate index has been less than 0.5 since 2003.

**Status:** Of the 19 well/spring sites monitored, all have tested below the drinking water standard (Maximum Contaminant Level, MCL of 10 mg/L) and all have less than 5 mg per liter of nitrate present. Less than half the sites tested have seen above average nitrate increases since testing began.


**Influencing factors:** Poor drainage systems, improperly maintained septic systems and improper fertilizer use can increase nitrate levels.

**Existing DNRP response:** King County plans to continue monitoring Vashon's wells and springs annually for nitrate concentrations.

**Priority new actions:** Additional locations have been sought to increase our understanding of island aquifers. King County intends to produce Vashon-Maury Island-wide water table, contour maps with seasonal variability that will be reported every year.



## Technical Notes

 For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Aquatic Environment](#) » Marine Water Quality



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                      |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources     | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Fresh Water Quality      | Marine Water Quality | Aquatic Biota   | Water Quantity       | Shorelines | Sediment Quality       |                       |                         |                  |

### MARINE WATER QUALITY

2007 Rating:

#### Marine Environment

**About this indicator:** King County's Marine Water Quality Index includes information about the conditions of marine waters. Our weighting system for the marine environment water quality applies 75 percent to eutrophication and 25 percent to fecal bacteria.

**Status:** While, in general, the quality of open waters in Puget Sound is good, marine water quality conditions in certain areas of King County show evidence of degradation. Waters that are in protected areas without much current are of concern, including Elliot Bay and Quartermaster Harbor.

**Influencing factors:** Storm water carrying nutrients from septic systems, chemicals from motor vehicles and phosphorus from fertilizers degrade marine water quality and reduce oxygen levels for the animals that live and depend on Puget Sound habitats.


#### What you can do:

- Properly dispose of harmful chemicals, including unused pharmaceuticals and latex paints.
- Maintain, repair, or replace failing private septic systems.
- Minimize the use of fertilizers and pesticides by practicing natural yard care.
- Wash your car on the grass or gravel instead of on the street or driveway, or take it to a car wash.


More information about King County's Freshwater Lakes and Streams is available by continuing below for these measures:

- [Eutrophication](#)
- [Fecal Bacteria in Marine Waters \(ambient and outfall\)](#)

#### Water Quality Components



#### Marine Environment - Water Quality Components



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Puget Sound Shoreline Stewardship Guidebook

Shoreline Practices for a Healthy Lake, River or Stream

##### At Work

Reduce your runoff, get a fee discount

Learn Best Practices to reduce Stormwater Pollution

Understand Industrial Waste Discharge Limits

#### Related Information

[Puget Sound Marine Topics](#)

[Puget Sound Watershed](#)

[Vashon Island Environmental Information](#)

[King County marine research vessel "Liberty"](#)

[Hood Canal Marine Life Struggling for Oxygen](#)

[Lower Duwamish Watershed](#)

[Marine Benthic Invertebrate Communities Near King County Wastewater Outfalls](#)

[Water and Land Resources Division](#)

#### Eutrophication

**About this indicator:** King County conducts monthly water quality monitoring at 14 offshore locations in Puget Sound. Offshore marine waters



in King County are monitored for temperature, salinity, density, dissolved oxygen, nutrients, chlorophyll and fecal coliform bacteria. These variables can be used to assess eutrophication, (the process by which dissolved oxygen concentrations are depressed due to algae growth primarily caused by nutrients), sewage waste (fecal coliform, ammonia), food availability to secondary producers (chlorophyll), and marine water habitat quality (temperature, salinity).

**Status:** 2007 findings indicate that the water quality at one of the stations sampled (Elliott Bay) is at a level of Moderate Concern. Additionally, the water quality at two of the stations sampled (Inner and Outer Quartermaster Harbor) are at levels of High Concern.



The percentage of stations of Moderate or High Concern is 21.4%, the highest level since 2000. This increase in the proportion of stations with Moderate or High Concern designations is mainly due to the addition of the two Quartermaster Harbor stations in 2007.

**Influencing factors:** Vertical water density patterns can be indicators of an area's potential sensitivity to developing low dissolved oxygen conditions. Low oxygen conditions are harmful to fish and other aquatic life and may occur as a result of the natural flow of low oxygenated Pacific Ocean water into the deep main basin of Puget Sound, in addition to processes such as eutrophication. Persistently low nitrate concentrations in surface water can indicate a potential sensitivity to nutrient-rich input such as stormwater runoff, industrial waste discharges, septic systems, and flow from rivers. Ammonia can be found at elevated concentrations as a byproduct of sewage, agricultural practices, and fertilizer use in urban areas.

**Existing DNRP response:** DNRP will continue to operate its wastewater treatment plants and conveyance system effectively to maintain low levels of nutrients discharged into marine waters. Nutrient levels are also addressed by the agency through storm water control management practices. Additionally, DNRP will continue to play an active role in the recently formed Puget Sound Partnership toward improving water quality throughout the entire Puget Sound.

**Priority new actions:** Stratification intensity and its persistence is beyond King County's influence, but should be monitored as it is an important indicator of areas sensitive to possible water quality problems. Dissolved oxygen levels in Quartermaster Harbor will be closely monitored.

**Percent marine offshore monitoring sites at moderate or high water quality concern levels**



## Fecal Bacteria in Marine Environment

**About this indicator:** The presence of fecal bacteria in water bodies indicates contamination with the fecal material of humans, birds or other warm-blooded animals. Although these bacteria are usually not harmful, they often occur with other disease-causing pathogens, and their presence at high levels indicates an increased possibility that people might get sick if they come into contact with the water.

This standard addresses water quality requirements for protecting swimming, SCUBA diving and other recreational uses. For marine surface waters, the current fecal coliform standard is a geometric mean of 14 colony forming units /100ml.

King County conducts monthly water quality monitoring at 13 offshore locations in Puget Sound. Offshore monitoring sites are divided into two categories, ambient and outfall sites. Ambient sites are chosen to reflect general, or ambient, environmental conditions, while outfall sites are located at King


County wastewater treatment plant outfalls and county-operated combined sewer overflow outfalls. Monitoring stations in Salmon Bay and Fauntleroy Cove were added in 2007. Data from those stations will be reflected in 2008 results.

**Status:** Fecal bacteria are not a concern in parts of the Puget Sound that surround King County. All ambient and outfall sites met the fecal coliform bacteria geometric mean standard in 2007.


**Influencing factors:** Non-point source pollution is the major cause of marine water contamination. Fecal coliform can enter Puget Sound from domestic animals, wildlife, storm water runoff, wastewater discharges and failing septic systems.

**Existing DNRP response:** DNRP will continue to manage its wastewater treatment plants and conveyance system effectively. The county is working with the Puget Sound Partnership effort toward protecting and restoring the health of marine waters.

**Priority new actions:** No changes in the monitoring program are planned for 2008.



**Fecal bacteria at ambient monitoring sites**  
2007 Findings  
[Click to download the PDF version.](#)



**Fecal bacteria at wastewater outfall sites**  
2007 findings  
[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

## Technical Notes

 For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

SEARCH  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Aquatic Environment](#) » Aquatic Biota



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                      |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources     | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Fresh Water Quality      | Marine Water Quality | Aquatic Biota   | Water Quantity       | Shorelines | Sediment Quality       |                       |                         |                  |

### AQUATIC BIOTA

2007 Rating:

**About this indicator:** King County's Aquatic Biota Index is derived from two main groupings of results regarding numbers of fish and stream insects. This weighting system applies 60 percent of fish results and 40 percent of the stream insects, or benthic indicators of biodiversity index results. Chinook salmon are the only fish reflected in this category. Other fish species should be included in the assessment of aquatic biota health, but there is no consistently collected data regarding these animals in King County.

**Status:** Information gathered over the last 100 years indicates an overall decline in the health of native, naturally spawning salmon populations in Puget Sound watersheds.

**Influencing factors:** Development and deteriorating water quality impact wildlife habitat — particularly the amounts of hard or paved surfaces, loss of tree cover and other changes to natural environments.


#### What you can do:

- Plant trees and reduce impervious surfaces by using pervious pavers in drive and walkways.
- Encourage your local city or town to make tree protection regulations stronger.
- Contact your elected officials and express how important wildlife protections are to you—including salmon restoration.

More information about King County's Fish and Stream Insects is available by continuing below for these measures:

- [Chinook Salmon](#)
- [Stream Insect Health](#)

#### Aquatic Biota Components



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Embrace Natural Yard Care

Home & garden hints for healthy streams & salmon

##### At Work

Apply Integrated Pest Management in your landscaping


#### Related Information

[Stream Bug monitoring](#)

[Shoreline Ecological Characterization](#)

### Chinook Salmon

**About this indicator:** Salmonid fishes native to King County include chinook, coho, sockeye/kokanee, pink and chum salmon, rainbow (including the anadromous form called "steelhead"), cutthroat, bull and dolly varden trout and pygmy and mountain whitefish. Each of these species has a diverse life history and relies upon a range of habitats for spawning, rearing, feeding and migration. They also have major cultural, economic and political roles in the Pacific



Northwest. Of these, Chinook, Bull trout, and Steelhead have been listed for protection under the Endangered Species Act. Throughout much of Washington State, the harvest and hatchery propagation of these fish populations and to a lesser extent, their habitat, are co-managed by the State of Washington, through the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WA DFW), and the treaty Indian tribes.

King County includes all or portions of four major watersheds, which are denitified by Watershed Resource Inventory Areas (WRIA): the Snohomish (WRIA 7), Cedar/Lake Washington (WRIA 8), Green/Duwamish (WRIA 9) and Puyallup/White (WRIA 10). Although King County does not manage fish populations directly, it does have jurisdictional responsibility for many activities, including land-use regulation, which greatly influences the quantity, quality and distribution of salmon habitats.

Natural chinook salmon spawning ground escapement is the number of mature, adult chinook salmon that escape fisheries and return to their stream of origin to spawn naturally. It is an indicator of the abundance of chinook salmon and can be used, along with other population indicators, to evaluate the overall health of marine and freshwater ecosystems.

Chinook salmon long-term recovery goals (recovery goals) were established to be reflective of characteristics of a viable salmon population<sup>1</sup>: abundance, geographic distribution, genetic and phenotypic diversity and productivity. These recovery goals were established for watersheds through the cooperative Puget Sound Shared Strategy process. The recovery goals to be targeted are 64,000 for WRIA 7, 12,200 for WRIA 8 and 27,000 for WRIA 9. There are no recovery goals for WRIA 10.

This indicator is based on the percent of natural chinook salmon escapement with respect to an adjusted annual recovery goal for each WRIA, where applicable. Our weighting system for this indicator is applied equally to WRIA 7, 8 and 9



**Status:** With the exception of increases on the Cedar (WRIA 8) and White Rivers (WRIA 10), the 2007 fish count was down from 2006 in WRIA 7, Lake Sammamish (WRIA 8) and WRIA 9. The increase on the White River (WRIA 10) was more than double in 2006 and has shown a steady increase since about 2000. Natural variations are expected due to a wide variety of influencing factors. Overall, the natural chinook salmon escapement results for each WRIA were far below the respective adjusted annual recovery goal and comprised of only 12 percent of the recovery target.

**Influencing factors:** Natural Chinook salmon escapement is related to the habitat and water quality of the County's rivers and streams, along with several other factors such as precipitation, hatcheries, biology, harvest, and flow management. Some annual variation in salmon returns is to be expected and is unrelated to local human influences. For example, natural cycles of ocean warming and cooling and longer term trends in climate can also greatly affect local salmonid productivity.

**Existing DNRP response:** Inter-jurisdictional, watershed-based salmon conservation plans have been completed for WRIA's 7, 8, 9 and 10. The plans were submitted to federal agencies for review in 2005, and accepted by the National Marine Fisheries Service in February 2006 with a few additions. The plans include actions for meeting long-term recovery goals. King County serves as the lead agency for two WRIA's and participates in the efforts and activities of all four. The county will continue its participation in the WRIA process and the larger, region wide Shared Strategy For Puget Sound process to secure funding for and implement the measures identified in these plans toward habitat improvement projects that should help to recover the species.

**Priority new actions:** King County is entering the implementation phase for the WRIA 7, 8 and 9 Salmon Conservation and Habitat Plans.

<sup>1</sup> A viable salmon population is defined as one with a negligible risk of extinction in 100 years. Negligible has been taken to mean less than 5%.



## Stream Insect Health

**About this indicator:** King County monitors stream health by collecting samples of benthic macroinvertebrates, commonly referred to as "bugs," from selected streams.

Scientists use a scorecard system called the Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity (B-IBI) to rank the health of streams. The scores are based on the types of stream bugs living in the stream and the number of different kinds of stream bugs present. By using this scoring system, we can compare very different streams to each other and rank their ecological health.

**Status:** The 2003 data are the most recent available. A total of 128 stations in 55 streams within 15 sub-basins across the Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish watershed (WRIA 8) and the Green/Duwamish watershed (WRIA 9) were sampled. Results for unincorporated and incorporated areas within King County are dramatically different. In 2003, 31 percent of the sampled streams in unincorporated areas had benthic insect communities in good or excellent condition, whereas none of the stream stations in incorporated areas rated this high.


**Influencing factors:** Development, pollutant runoff, loss of forest cover, stream and wetland ecological health, elevated stream temperatures, fish migration barriers, and of invasive and non-native plants are a few factors that can have an affect on the stream insect populations. Insufficient flows in streams can reduce number of sampling sites, affecting annual comparisons.

**Existing DNRP response:** WLR continues to implement programs focusing on minimizing degradation from development and pollutant runoff from farms, preventing the loss of forest cover and its numerous stormwater benefits, or implementing watershed improvement projects. King County's Stormwater Program focuses on flow control to minimize adverse effects from development, provides surface water design standards for new development and inspects and maintains stormwater control facilities.


The county continues to work with landowners to restore streamside parcels that have important benefits as aquatic resources. In addition, WLR's capital projects program builds small and large stream and wetland enhancement projects. Basin stewards work with the local community to respond to resident's inquiries for watershed protection, coordinate efforts among diverse public agencies, facilitate watershed project implementation, provide assistance to monitoring programs and provide public education opportunities. The Agriculture Program works with farmers and livestock owners to prevent agricultural pollutants from running off into streams.

**Priority new actions:** Implementation of the county's Critical Areas Ordinance and federal total maximum daily load (TMDL) requirements for impaired water bodies are regulations that will also support water quality improvements in both incorporated and unincorporated areas.

The taxonomic analysis of the 2005, 2006 and 2007 B-IBI samples will be complete in late 2008.







### Stream Insect Health

2003 Findings

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

## KingStat

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Aquatic Environment](#) » Water Quantity



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                      |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources     | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Fresh Water Quality      | Marine Water Quality | Aquatic Biota   | Water Quantity       | Shorelines | Sediment Quality       |                       |                         |                  |

### WATER QUANTITY

2007 Rating:

**About this indicator:** King County's Water Quantity Index is derived from two main groupings of freshwater results describing the conditions of rivers and streams and groundwater. Lakes and wetlands do not factor into the index at this time. Our weighting system applies 80 percent to rivers and streams and 20 percent to groundwater condition results toward the overall water quantity rating. The weighting of groundwater quantity would be larger if data for groundwater well water levels for other areas besides Vashon-Maury Islands was collected on a regular basis. Although, there is no indicator for the marine environment, an indicator may be added next year with respect to sea level.

**Status:** Overall below standard with some areas of lesser concerns.


**Influencing factors:** Extensive development can substantially alter stream flow patterns and how they respond to rainfall. Changes in land use and/or vegetation, increases in groundwater withdrawals and climatic changes can adversely affect the quantity of groundwater.

**What you can do:** Practice conservation with respect to groundwater usage, low-water use gardening, adhere to regulations related to groundwater pumping, and support efforts to practice habitat restoration and best management practices to mitigate runoff resulting in flash flooding and channel erosion.

More information about King County's Water Quantity Index is available by continuing below for these measures:

- [Normative Flows on Streams & Rivers](#)
- [Groundwater Water Levels on Vashon-Maury Islands](#)

#### Water Quantity Components



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Puget Sound Shoreline Stewardship Guidebook

Shoreline Practices for a Healthy Lake, River or Stream

##### At Work

Reduce your runoff, get a fee discount

Learn Best Practices to reduce Stormwater Pollution

Understand Industrial Waste Discharge Limits

#### Related Information

[Puget Sound Marine Topics](#)

[Puget Sound Watershed](#)

[Vashon Island Environmental Information](#)

[King County marine research vessel "Liberty"](#)

[Hood Canal Marine Life Struggling for Oxygen](#)

[Lower Duwamish Watershed](#)


[Marine Benthic Invertebrate Communities Near King County Wastewater Outfalls](#)

[Water and Land Resources Division](#)

### Normative Flows on Streams & Rivers



**About this indicator:** This indicator uses a stream "flashiness" index — based on the reciprocal of the fraction of days during the year that the flow rises above the annual mean daily flow. Because peak stream flow rises and falls more quickly in urban areas than forested areas, urban streams tend to have a smaller fraction of days during the year when the flow is above the annual mean daily flow, and a higher "flashiness" index score. This increase in the "flashiness" index score represents the loss of water storage capability of soils and vegetation due to urbanization. To assess conditions throughout the county, the median stream "flashiness" is calculated each year across all streams where flow is measured. The median stream "flashiness" score represents the degree of water storage ability where half of the streams are flashier and half are less flashy.



**Status:** Flows from 16 stream sites in King County were measured and their "flashiness" calculated during the 2007 water year (October 2006 — September 2007). Flows for four of these streams were measured by the United States Geological Survey. The median of the "flashiness" index scores across all streams measured in King County has increased between 1945 and 2007 and was lower in 2007 than in 2006.

These data suggest that increased urbanization in King County has resulted in faster surface runoff and peak stream flow rise and fall than previously occurred for some of the streams

**Influencing factors:** Extensive development can substantially alter stream flow patterns and how they respond to rainfall. In urban areas, surface runoff occurs more quickly than in forested areas because less rainfall is absorbed by the vegetation and soil. Faster runoff in urban areas results in higher peak stream flows rising and falling more rapidly than under forested conditions. Increased peak flows and "flashiness" leads to the most obvious effects from a human perspective — flash flooding and channel erosion. From a biological perspective, streams with greater "flashiness" are disturbed more often. Organisms that survive in these conditions are those that have adapted to more frequent and severe disturbances.

**Existing DNRP response:** King County has a range of regulatory, educational, and on-the-ground programs to reduce the impacts of development on streams and reduce the amount of "flashiness." The County's Drainage Design Manual directs drainage requirements for all new development.

**Priority new actions:** In compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit requirements from the state (as part of the federal Clean Water Act), a closer linkage between the effectiveness of stormwater controls and water quality and flows is expected. This may translate into more monitoring at retention / detention ponds to make sure they are working as expected.

## Groundwater Water Levels on Vashon-Maury Islands



**About this indicator:** King County has been tracking groundwater quantity on Vashon-Maury Island since 2001. Water levels are tracked frequently in both volunteer and dedicated monitoring wells. King County's goal is to ensure sustainable water quantity through appropriate zoning regulations and high water quality through effective land-use and on-site septic regulations.

**Status:** Groundwater levels are decreasing.

**Influencing factors:** Changes in land use and/or vegetation, increases in groundwater withdrawals and climatic changes can adversely affect the quantity of groundwater. Changes in 2007 water levels are also thought to have been caused by reduced precipitation/recharge to island aquifers.

**Existing DNRP response:** King County plans to continue monitoring Vashon's wells and springs annually for water levels measurements.

Priority new actions: Additional locations have been sought to take water level measurements and increase our understanding of island aquifers. King County intends to produce Vashon-Maury Island-wide water table, contour maps with seasonal variability that will be reported every year.



### Groundwater Water Levels on Vashon-Maury Islands

2007 Findings

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

## Technical Notes

[+](#) For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.



**Updated: December 18, 2008**

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

SEARCH  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Aquatic Environment](#) » Shorelines



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                      |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources     | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Fresh Water Quality      | Marine Water Quality | Aquatic Biota   | Water Quantity       | Shorelines | Sediment Quality       |                       |                         |                  |

### SHORELINES

2007 Rating:

**About this indicator:** King County's Shorelines Index is derived from two main groupings of results describing the conditions of shoreline along marine and freshwater environments. Wetland conditions do not factor into the index at this time because of inadequate data. Our weighting system applies 40 percent each to armoring in incorporated King County and armoring in unincorporated King County, and 20 percent to stream riparian habitat condition results toward the overall shorelines index.

**Status:** A high percentage of shoreline has been armored with bulkheads and other structures. Countywide, stream riparian areas in rural areas have higher forest coverage than urban areas.


**Influencing factors:** Bulkheads impede natural erosion and cut off the supply of sand, rocks and other natural features that are home to native plant and animal species. Less forests along stream riparian corridors result in less stormwater control, less habitat for forest species, and aquatic systems that are less-healthy for fish.

#### What you can do:

- Consider alternatives to bulkheads and other artificial barriers to marine shorelines.
- Encourage your local city or town to make tree protection regulations stronger.

More information about King County's Shoreline Index is available by continuing below for these measures:

- [Marine Shoreline Armoring](#)
- [Stream Riparian Habitat](#)



#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Puget Sound Shoreline Stewardship Guidebook

Shoreline Practices for a Healthy Lake, River or Stream

##### Related Information

Vashon Island Environmental Information

Shoreline Ecology

Shoreline Parcel Characterization


Interactive Shorelines Map

Shoreline Master Plan Updated

### Marine Shoreline armoring

**About this indicator:** King County's Shorelines Marine Environment Index includes information about the conditions of marine shorelines. Our weighting system applies 50 percent towards unincorporated/Vashon Island armoring and 50 percent toward incorporated area shoreline armoring.

Shoreline armoring can take the form of a bulkhead, sea wall, riprap, or any other built impediment to naturally advancing tidewaters. The amount of shoreline that has been armored can be



used as a general indicator of the condition of marine shorelines.

When armoring is present, the health of habitats decline in the nearshore area (the water, shoreline and adjacent upland areas). The nearshore area is an important feeding, nesting and resting ground for many fish and wildlife species, including young salmon as they migrate from the stream of their birth to marine rearing areas.

**Status:** Conclusions from a baseline survey for shoreline armoring in 2005 show that many beach-feeding sediment sources have been locked up behind armoring. Much of King County's mainland shoreline has been armored — in stark contrast to the relatively natural shorelines along Vashon-Maury Islands.


The Central Puget Sound Basin is one of the most heavily urbanized areas within Puget Sound, and King County's armored marine shoreline is indicative of this.

**Influencing factors:** Property owners build bulkheads to protect their homes and businesses from erosion.

**Existing DNRP response:** King County is working to decrease the rate of new and currently existing shoreline armoring in unincorporated areas. Recognizing that not all armoring has the same impacts, these reductions will be focused where sediment delivery is restricted and most important. Removing or preventing armoring in deeper, inter-tidal waters is also a priority.

Many Vashon Island waterfront property owners who are applying for flexibility to critical areas regulations through the Rural Stewardship Planning process are being provided with alternatives to bulkhead construction.

**Priority new actions:** With a baseline in place, follow-up surveys of new armoring every five years will provide useful information. This will allow for a more realistic review of changes that occur naturally and the results of those initiated by King County. Additionally, creating better guidance on the appropriate location and the type of new shoreline armoring is expected in the King County's Shoreline Master Program update.



#### Marine Shoreline armoring

2005 Findings

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

## Stream Riparian Habitat

**About this indicator:** King County's Shorelines Freshwater Environment Index includes information about the conditions of stream riparian habitats. There is no program for Lakes and River Floodplain Habitats.

Increased population and development have substantially altered the landscape in King County over the past two centuries. This indicator reflects landscape changes that protect forest and aquatic habitats along streamside, or riparian, corridors.

Forest data were derived from a 2001 Landsat image, and impervious area data were derived from 2000 multispectral images. The width of riparian areas along stream banks varied between a minimum 165-foot buffer on each side and expanded to include wetland and steep slope areas. Possible landslide areas that extend past this buffer were also included. This approach to defining "riparian areas" is intended to encompass functional features of adjacent lands that could have been missed if a simple buffer width were used.


**Status:** Stream riparian land cover was categorized by urban vs. rural areas. Countywide, stream riparian areas in rural areas (71percent) have higher forest coverage than urban areas (39 percent), as shown in Chart 1 and Figure 1. Impervious coverage along the riparian corridor in urban areas (26 percent) was almost seven times more than in rural areas (4 percent).

**Influencing factors:** Forests naturally regulate stormwater runoff, protect water quality, provide habitat for many species, and maintain healthy streams and rivers for salmon and other fish. Less forests result in less stormwater control, less habitat for forest species, and aquatic systems that are less-healthy for fish. Increases in impervious surfaces are generally associated with the highest rates of stormwater runoff, the highest degradation in water quality, and the most impacts on forest and aquatic species.


**Existing DNRP response:** Land-use regulations, which were updated as part of the Critical Areas Ordinance in 2004, attempt to maintain a minimum of 65 percent forest cover and limit impervious areas to less than 10 percent in rural, unincorporated King County. They also provide extra protection for aquatic riparian areas. King County DNRP intends to monitor forest cover and impervious area within riparian zones.

The county works with landowners to restore streamside parcels that have important benefits as aquatic resources. In addition, the King County Water and Land Resources Division's capital projects program builds small and large stream and wetland enhancement projects while protecting public safety. Habitat restoration projects include streamside and wetland planting and in-stream habitat improvements.

**Priority new actions:** King County is in the midst of updating its 30-year old Shoreline Master Program, which guides land-use activities along shorelines of marine areas and most lakes and streams in unincorporated King County. The first step in this effort is to review current shoreline conditions, including ecology, public access, land use and historic resources. The program update, which is expected to be completed in late 2008, will include changes that will have an effect on this indicator.








## Stream Riparian Habitat

2001 Findings

*Click to download the PDF version.*

## Technical Notes

 For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

**SEARCH**  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Aquatic Environment](#) » Sediment Quality



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                      |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources     | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Fresh Water Quality      | Marine Water Quality | Aquatic Biota   | Water Quantity       | Shorelines | Sediment Quality       |                       |                         |                  |

### SEDIMENT QUALITY

2007 Rating:

#### Sediments in Puget Sound

**About this indicator:** King County monitors sediments in lakes, streams, and at marine sites as part of its ambient monitoring programs. Sediment quality is an important indicator of environmental health, and along with indicators of water quality, habitat, and the aquatic food web (i.e. plankton, invertebrates, and fish), it can present a clearer picture of environmental quality. Once contaminants are washed into surface waters and attach to bottom sediments they can persist where people can be exposed to them directly or indirectly by eating fish that have been caught in our local lakes, streams, and along shores where some of these contaminants can bioaccumulate up the food chain.

Our weighting system applies 60 percent of the freshwater index and 40 percent of the marine environment index to the overall sediment quality index. The freshwater index is applied equally at 50 percent to lakes and streams. The marine environment index is applied equally at 50 percent to ambient sites and 50 percent to point source sites.

**Status:** Overall most of the lake stations found to have chemical concentrations high enough to probably be causing adverse effects in aquatic organisms were located in Lake Union. Contaminants were found in streams in concentrations high enough to probably be causing adverse effects in aquatic organisms. Of the ambient sampling, most stations passed all of the chemical criteria.


#### What you can do:

- Properly dispose of pharmaceuticals, harmful chemicals and paints, instead of pouring them down the drain or allowing them to run off the ground.
- Minimize use of fertilizers and pesticides by practicing natural yard care.
- Wash your car on the grass or gravel instead of on the street or driveway, or take it to a car wash.
- Properly dispose of or manage pet and livestock wastes.


More information about King County's Sediment Quality Index is available by continuing below for these measures:

- [Large Lakes Sediment Quality](#)

#### Sediment Quality Components



#### Sediment Quality Components



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Puget Sound Shoreline Stewardship Guidebook

Shoreline Practices for a Healthy Lake, River or Stream

##### At Work

Reduce your runoff, get a fee discount

Learn Best Practices to reduce Stormwater Pollution

Understand Industrial Waste Discharge Limits

#### Related Information

[Puget Sound Marine Topics](#)

[Puget Sound Watershed](#)

[Vashon Island Environmental Information](#)



- [Stream Sediment Quality](#)
- [Marine Point Source Sediment Quality](#)
- [Marine Ambient Sediment Quality](#)

## Large Lakes Sediment Quality

**About this indicator:** To understand what effect chemicals in sediments may be having on aquatic life, chemical concentrations are compared to sediment quality guidelines. The Washington State Department of Ecology has not promulgated numeric freshwater sediment chemical standards, but has evaluated existing numeric sediment quality guidelines and proposed a new set of numeric guidelines, known as the floating percentile method, for use in Washington State freshwater sediments.

In addition to using the floating percentile-derived guidelines, a more widely used set of guidelines that were developed by Smith et al (1996) in the Great Lakes region in 1996 were also used. These Smith guidelines represent a good balance between sensitivity and efficiency and also include guidelines for organochlorine pesticides (DDT, dieldrin, etc.), which are not included among the floating point guidelines.

The Major Lakes Sediment Monitoring Program was begun in 1999 in Lakes Sammamish, Washington, and Union. An updated 10-year program was launched in 2007 to collect sediment quality information near storm drains, swimming beaches, and wildlife habitat areas. Additionally, a two-tiered sampling design allows for the assessment of long term trends in the deep main basins of the three major lakes.


This indicator is divided into three ratings: 1) adverse effects to aquatic organisms from chemical concentrations are unlikely; 2) adverse effects to aquatic organisms from chemical concentrations are uncertain; and 3) adverse effects to aquatic organisms from chemical concentration are probable. The three large lakes, Lake Washington, Union and Sammamish are weighted equally at 30 percent each for this indicator.


**Status:** A total of 60 stations have been sampled in Lakes Sammamish, Washington, and Union. Overall, most of the stations found to have chemical concentrations high enough to probably be causing adverse effects in aquatic organisms were located in Lake Union. Lake Sammamish sediment quality was the best of the three lakes, while Lake Washington sediment quality was mostly good except for a few localized areas.

**Influencing factors:** Point sources, stormwater, and other discharges such as irrigation runoff, can wash contaminants into surface waters. Additionally, historical contamination from the industrial and commercial areas surrounding Lake Union is still evident.

**Existing DNRP response:** King County is committed to monitoring large lake sediment quality to ensure their continued health, as well as the health of the public who live near or use the lake's many resources.

**Priority new actions:** The updated 10-year Major Lakes Sediment Monitoring Program will continue to collect sediment quality information near storm drains, swimming beaches, and wildlife habitat areas. King County will continue to conduct hazardous waste management and outreach to reduce contaminant discharges, and coordinate trouble calls to investigate illegal and accidental spills reported by citizens.






**Large Lakes Sediment Quality**  
1999 - 2001 findings

**About this indicator:** To understand what effect chemicals in sediments may be having on aquatic life, chemical concentrations are compared to sediment quality guidelines. The Washington State Department of Ecology has not promulgated numeric freshwater sediment chemical standards, but has evaluated existing numeric sediment quality guidelines and proposed a new set of numeric guidelines, known as the floating percentile method, for use in Washington State freshwater sediments.

In addition to using the floating percentile-derived guidelines, a more widely used set of guidelines that were developed by Smith et al. in the Great Lakes region in 1996 were also used. These Smith guidelines represent a good balance between sensitivity and efficiency and also include guidelines for organochlorine pesticides (DDT, dieldrin, etc.), which are not included among the floating point guidelines.



The Stream Sediment Monitoring Program was begun in 1987 in WRIAs 8 and 9 as part of the overall Lakes and Streams Ambient Monitoring Program. An updated 10-year program began in 2004 to monitor the effects of all sources (point sources, stormwater, and other discharges) to the streams. Additional parameters were added to the existing sediment monitoring program to better understand the range of contaminants that affect sediment quality. A two-tiered sampling design allows for the assessment of sediment quality in individual stream basins as well as long-term trend analysis.

This indicator is divided into three ratings: 1) adverse effects to aquatic organisms from chemical concentrations are unlikely; 2) adverse effects to aquatic organisms from chemical concentrations are uncertain; and 3) adverse effects to aquatic organisms from chemical concentration are probable.


**Status:** A total of 70 stations have been sampled in King County streams between the September 2004 and August 2006. Metals, phthalates, and legacy pesticides, such as DDT have been found in a few locations in concentrations high enough to probably be causing adverse effects in aquatic organisms. Most of Bear and Little Bear Creek sediment quality was rated as having unlikely adverse effects.

**Influencing factors:** Point sources, stormwater, and other discharges such as irrigation runoff, can wash contaminants into surface waters.

**Existing DNRP response:** King County is committed to monitoring stream sediment quality to ensure

their continued health, as well as the health of the public who live near or use the streams' many resources.

**Priority new actions:** The updated 10-year Streams Sediment Monitoring Program will continue to collect sediment quality information to monitor the effects of all sources (point sources, stormwater, and other discharges) to the streams. King County will continue to conduct hazardous waste management and outreach to reduce contaminant discharges, and coordinate trouble calls to investigate illegal and accidental spills reported by citizens.



**Streams Sediment Quality**  
2004 - 2006 findings

## Marine Point Source Sediment Quality

**About this indicator:** Washington State's Sediment Management Standards seeks to reduce and ultimately eliminate adverse effects on biological resources and any significant human health risk from surface sediments in marine, low salinity or estuarine and freshwater environments. The Sediment Quality Standard, or "no adverse effects level," is the most protective chemical standard for marine sediments. The Cleanup Screening Level, or the "minor adverse effects level," helps identify areas of potential concern that may be designated cleanup sites.

The Sediment Quality Standard has been selected as the indicator because it is the more sensitive of the two criteria for environmental protection. Data from 2001 are used because they represent the most recent comprehensive survey of sediment quality in King County. In 2001, sediment sites were divided into two categories. Ambient sites were chosen to reflect general, or ambient, environmental conditions. Point source stations are located near King County wastewater treatment plant outfalls and combined sewer overflow outfalls. Data from 2001 is still relevant for analysis because sediments (particularly those that are polluted) move slowly and do not change much over five years unless clean up efforts have been taken.

Details related to a 2007 sampling event for ambient stations are presented with the indicator for Marine Environment — Ambient Sediment Quality.

**Status:** Of the 15 point source-related sites that exceed the Sediment Quality Standard, eight do not require clean up or monitoring. Six of the remaining seven point source sites are associated with combined sewer overflow outfalls, and one is associated with an emergency overflow.

**Influencing factors:** Many pollutants found in the environment are not detected in water, but are attached to sediment particles. Once in the sediments, these pollutants can directly harm marine organisms or be reintroduced to the food chain through the organisms found in marine sediments.

**Existing DNRP response:** Strategies to achieve the outcome goal focus on collaborating with other organizations, including the City of Seattle, Port of Seattle, and Boeing, with which King County has joined to form a public-private partnership called the Lower Duwamish Waterway Group. This group will be funding cleanups at "early action sites" as part of the Lower Duwamish Waterway federal Superfund process. A partial cleanup was completed in 2004 at the first of these sites, the Duwamish/Diagonal Way site. A follow-up cleanup was completed in 2005.

**Priority new actions:** The cleanup of the Lower Duwamish Waterway includes a multi-agency, source-control effort to reduce the potential for future recontamination. Additional sediment site cleanups may be completed later under Superfund, or as part of other activities in the Duwamish waterways. It is expected that three to five additional sites could be addressed by 2010.



**Marine Point Source Sediment Quality**  
2001 findings

## Marine Ambient Sediment Quality

**About this indicator:** Washington state's Sediment Management Standards seeks to reduce and ultimately eliminate adverse effects on biological resources and any significant human health risk from surface sediments in marine, low salinity or estuarine and freshwater environments. King County developed a new ambient marine sediment sampling program in 2007. Data from subtidal marine sediment samples collected from stations throughout the Puget Sound area within King County were compared to the State of Washington Sediment Management Standards (SMS) chemical criteria (Chapter 173-204 WAC).

As part of the new plan, King County will be collecting subtidal marine sediment samples from eight locations in Elliott Bay, every two years, and from three locations in the Puget Sound main basin and three associated embayments (Salmon Bay, Fauntleroy Cove, and Quartermaster Harbor), every five years. In this year, sediment chemistry data from 14 locations were used for this indicator.


**Status:** Eleven of 14 stations (79%) passed all SMS chemical criteria. Three of 14 stations (21%) failed one or more SMS chemical criteria. The station in Quartermaster Harbor failed the mercury criterion, the station in East Passage failed the bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate criterion, and the station at

Harbor Island failed the criteria for mercury and butyl benzyl phthalate.

**Influencing factors:** Many pollutants found in the environment are not detected in water, but are attached to sediment particles. Once in the sediments, these pollutants can directly harm marine organisms or be reintroduced to the food chain through the organisms found in marine sediments.


**Existing DNRP response:** King County will continue to monitor ambient sediment quality in its marine waters every two years in Elliott Bay and every five years in the central basin of Puget Sound and associated embayments.

**Priority new actions:** There are no "priority new actions" planned for the next year.



**Marine Ambient Sediment Quality**  
2007 findings

## Technical Notes

 For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.  
[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

SEARCH  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » Land and Resources



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS      |                  |                 |                                  |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment           | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption             | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Forest Cover & Imperviousness |                  | Agriculture     | Forest Production and Protection |            | Terrestrial Biota      |                       |                         |                  |

### LAND AND RESOURCES

2007 Rating

#### About this Indicator

This indicator summarizes the status of conditions that address the conservation of land and other natural resources in King County. The land and resources included in this indicator are generally ones that King County's Department of Natural Resources and Parks seeks to improve through its program and service delivery. While DNRP can track certain aspects of agriculture and forestry protection and productivity, we have the ability to only periodically track levels of forest cover and imperviousness and have no regular or comprehensive way to track and understand changes in terrestrial/land-based biota (plants and animals).

#### Status

Agriculture and forestry productivity and protection levels in King County are generally stable and near their targeted levels. Currently there are 41,150 acres of zoned farmland in the county, some of which is not farmable due to wetlands, steep slopes and other conditions. The development rights on 13,208 agricultural acres have been purchased through the Farmland Preservation Program.

Forest protection levels remain at or near targets, with about 30% of the rural acres covered by stewardship plans or enrolled in incentive programs.

#### Influencing factors

A wide range of State and Federal policies, economic conditions, and the decisions of individual property owners affect the land and resources conservation practices here. Markets for agricultural and timber products, priorities of landowners, conservation incentives of the Farm Bill, and consumer preferences all bear on landowner decisions that affect conservation.


Budget allocations, regulatory and policy changes all play a role in land conservation and acquisition activities. The ability of the Farmland Preservation Program to purchase development rights depends on the available funding and farmland values vary widely depending on the location of the farm in the county.

#### DNRP response

DNRP has been advancing a range of innovative programs to encourage and support the conservation of land and resources in King County. These include:

- Puget Sound Fresh;
- Transfer of Development Rights program;
- Local Action on Biodiversity;

#### Land & Resources Components



#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

- Create your own Native Plant Landscape
- Volunteer for a Habitat Restoration Project

##### At Work

- Develop a Forest Stewardship Plan
- Reduce Holiday Food Waste
- Wasteless Holiday

#### Related Information

- Forestry Topics
- King County Ecological Lands
- Greenprint for King County
- GIS Center iMap

- The Farmland Preservation Program; and
- Various Forest Conservation programs

## What you can do:

Landowners interested in improving conservation practices have a range of useful; resources to draw upon. Important actions may include:

- [Develop a conservation and/or biodiversity protection plan](#)
- [Take a forest stewardship class](#)
- [Transfer development rights](#)

As a consumer in King County, you can help maintain the viability of local agriculture by purchasing from local farmers, see: <http://www.pugetsoundfresh.org> More information about King County's Land and Resources indicators is available by continuing to these indicators:

- [Forest Cover & Imperviousness](#)
- [Agricultural Production & Protection](#)
- [Forest Production & Protection](#)
- [Terrestrial Biota](#)

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

**Updated: December 18, 2008**

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County





King County  
Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

SEARCH  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Land and Resources](#) » Forest Cover and Imperviousness



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS      |                  |                 |                                  |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment           | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption             | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Forest Cover & Imperviousness |                  | Agriculture     | Forest Production and Protection |            | Terrestrial Biota      |                       |                         |                  |

### FOREST COVER AND IMPERVIOUSNESS

2007 Rating:  

**About this indicator:** Increased population and development have substantially altered the landscape in King County over the past two centuries. Of particular interest for the protection of salmon and other aquatic resources is the conversion of forest and natural land cover to hard or impervious surfaces, such as roofs, sidewalks parking lots and roads.

This indicator reflects landscape changes that protect forest and aquatic habitats. The percent of the landscape maintained as forest, and the percent that has been converted to impervious area, is presented watershed-wide for all of King County. Forest data were derived from a 2001 Landsat image, and impervious area data were derived from 2000 multispectral images.

**Status:** Total land cover was categorized by urban vs. rural areas. Countywide, rural areas (67 percent) have higher forest coverage than urban areas (17 percent). Impervious coverage in urban areas (47 percent) was almost 10 times more than in rural areas (5 percent).

**Influencing factors:** Forests naturally regulate stormwater runoff, provide habitat for many species and maintain healthy streams and rivers for salmon and other fish. Less forests result in less stormwater control, less habitat for forest species and aquatic systems that are less healthy for fish and other species. Increases in impervious surfaces are generally associated with the highest rates of stormwater runoff, the highest degradation in water quality and the most impacts on forest and aquatic species.

**Existing DNRP response:** Land-use regulations, recently updated as part of the Critical Areas Ordinance in 2004, attempt to maintain a minimum of 65 percent forest cover and limit impervious areas to less than 10 percent in rural, unincorporated King County. King County DNRP intends to monitor forest cover and impervious areas.


**Priority new actions:** King County is in the midst of updating its 30-year old Shoreline Master Program, which guides land-use activities along shorelines of marine areas and most lakes and streams in unincorporated King County. The first step in this effort is to review current shoreline conditions, including ecology, public access, land use and historic resources. The program update, which is expected to be completed in late 2008, will include changes that will have some effect on this

#### Forest Cover & Imperviousness Components



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### Terrestrial land cover for King County - 2003



#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

- Create your own Native Plant Landscape
- Volunteer for a Habitat Restoration Project


##### At Work

- Develop a Forest Stewardship Plan
- Smart Growth

#### Related Information

- Forestry Topics
- King County Ecological Lands
- Greenprint for King County
- GIS Center iMap
- Native Plants
- Snoqualmie Valley farmers' conservation efforts
- Plant Biodiversity
- PCBs Threaten Duwamish River Cleanup
- Arsenic and lead contamination in King County soil
- Wa Ecology soil study of King County

indicator.



### Forest covered and impervious areas

2003 Findings

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

## Technical Notes

[+](#) For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

SEARCH  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Land and Resources](#) » Agriculture



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS      |                  |                 |                                  |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment           | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption             | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Forest Cover & Imperviousness |                  | Agriculture     | Forest Production and Protection |            | Terrestrial Biota      |                       |                         |                  |

### AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION & PROTECTION

2007 Rating:

**About this indicator:** Agriculture is an important land use in the county. The production of food is a critical contribution to supporting the healthy diets of King County citizens. Farms provide important benefits such as providing habitat for wildlife and fish, improve water quality, and offer opportunities to learn about our local environment.

One major challenge to maintaining agriculture in the county is the ability of farmers to find affordable land. The Farmland Preservation Program helps preserve agriculture by purchasing the development rights from farmland. This helps reduce the cost of farmland by discouraging other non-farm uses.

**Existing DNRP response:** In cooperation with the King County Agriculture Commission, DNRP continues to identify and prioritize farms that could be enrolled in the Farmland Preservation Program. As funding becomes available, we work with the landowner to purchase their development rights.

We monitor and suggest updates to the County's Comprehensive Plan and Code for policies and regulations that adversely affect (or don't reflect the changing nature of) agriculture. We work to develop incentives that encourage farming in the county.


#### What you can do:

- Purchase local farm products. For a list of local farms see [www.pugetsoundfresh.org](http://www.pugetsoundfresh.org)
- Support local farm preservation efforts
- If you own land that is not being farmed, consider enrolling it the FarmLink Program. Please see [www.cascadeharvest.org](http://www.cascadeharvest.org)

More information about King County's Agricultural Production & Protection Index is available by continuing below for these measures:

- [Acres in Farmland Preservation Program](#)
- [Acres in Production in APD](#)

#### Agricultural Protection & Production Components



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

- Create your own Native Plant Landscape
- Volunteer for a Habitat Restoration Project

##### At Work

- Develop a Forest Stewardship Plan
- Smart Growth

#### Related Information

- Forestry Topics
- King County Ecological Lands
- Greenprint for King County
- GIS Center iMap
- Native Plants
- Snoqualmie Valley farmers' conservation efforts
- Plant Biodiversity
- PCBs Threaten Duwamish River Cleanup
- Arsenic and lead contamination in King County soil
- Wa Ecology soil study of King County

### Acres in Farmland Preservation Program

**About this indicator:** The Farmland Preservation Program helps preserve agriculture by purchasing the development rights from farmland. This helps reduce the cost of farmland by discouraging other non-farm uses.

**Status:** The development rights on 13,208 acres have been purchased through the Farmland Preservation Program

**Influencing factors:** The ability of the Farmland Preservation Program to purchase development rights depends on the available funding. Farmland values vary widely depending on the location of the farm in the county


**Priority new actions:** Continue to explore new and enhanced funding options for the Farmland Preservation Program.

## Acres in Production in APD

**About this indicator:** The number of acres in production is an important indicator of the health of agriculture in the county. Local food production is critical to the food security of the county.


**Status:** Currently there are 41,150 acres of zoned farmland in the county. Some of that land is not farmable due to wetlands, steep slopes and other conditions. Therefore, 23,000 acres are actually farmed. In addition there are 25,000 acres of land farmed in other areas of the county, mainly on RA zoned land. When taking into account the variable methods in measuring farmed properties from one reporting period to another, the amount of farmed acres has remained relatively stable.

Acres in Production in APD



**Influencing factors:** There are other uses than agriculture allowed in the APDs. One of the more popular uses is for lifestyle reasons. This reduces the ability of a person who wants to farm to compete successfully for land

**Priority new actions:** Continue to develop marketing and regulatory incentives to encourage farming throughout the county




### Agriculture Production District in King County

2003 Findings

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

## Technical Notes

 For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

**Updated: December 18, 2008**

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County





King County

Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

 **SEARCH**  
☐ Search this section
You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Land and Resources](#) » Forest Production and Protection

## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS      |                  |                 |                                  |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment           | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption             | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Forest Cover & Imperviousness |                  | Agriculture     | Forest Production and Protection |            | Terrestrial Biota      |                       |                         |                  |

### FOREST PRODUCTION AND PROTECTION

2007 Rating:

**About this indicator:** This forestry indicator combines a look at forest land conservation with forest production trend information. The indicators include both private and public lands.

The Forest Production District (FPD), which is the county's designated forestland of long term commercial significance, is 824,000 acres, over half of King County. Another 52,630 acres have been identified as Rural Forest Focus Areas (RFFA); these are blocks of the Rural Area that are predominantly forested.

The number of acres of forestland in the FPD and the number of acres of forested land conserved through easements limiting the development rights are used as indicators of long term conservation of working forest.

Washington Department of Revenue data is used to track the volume of timber harvested in King County each year. It is an indicator of the economic activity of forestry reflecting the general health of the forest industry. It is broken down into public and private lands.

**DNRP Response:** The DNRP Forestry Program works on County policy to encourage forestry and to ensure that the County is meeting its obligations under the state's Growth Management Act to protect forestland of long term commercial significance. Policies encourage both the protection of the land base and support for continued forestry as a commercial activity. The Department staffs the Rural Forest Commission, which advises on County policies, regulations and programs relevant to forestry. The Department also has a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program that works with landowners to secure development rights easements.


#### What you can do

- [Develop a forest stewardship plan for your forested property](#)
- [Learn how to protect your home from wildfire and have a healthy forest too](#)
- [Consider enrolling protecting your forested land through a property tax reduction or transfer of development rights program](#)

More information about King County's Agricultural Production & Protection Index is available by continuing below for these measures:

- [Acres of Development Rights Transferred](#)
- [Total Acres in Forest Production District](#)
- [Private — volume of timber harvested \(MBF\)](#)
- [Public \(non-federal\) — volume of timber harvested \(MBF\)](#)

#### Forest Protection & Production Components



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

- Create your own Native Plant Landscape
- Volunteer for a Habitat Restoration Project

##### At Work

- Develop a Forest Stewardship Plan
- Smart Growth

#### Related Information

- Forestry Topics
- King County Ecological Lands
- Greenprint for King County
- GIS Center iMap
- Native Plants
- Snoqualmie Valley farmers' conservation efforts
- Plant Biodiversity
- PCBs Threaten Duwamish River Cleanup
- Arsenic and lead contamination in King County soil
- Wa Ecology soil study of King County

### Acres of Development Rights Transferred

**About this indicator:** This indicator looks at acres preserved in forest in the Forest Production District and Rural Forest Focus Areas. Securing easements on private forestland to restrict development is a relatively new conservation tool in King County.

**Status:** The development rights on 92,841 acres of forest have been purchased through the King County TDR program. Most of the acreage shown, some 89,520 acres, represents the Snoqualmie Tree Farm.

**Influencing factors:** Adding to the acreage under easements is a result of complicated negotiations, funding availability, and willingness of landowners to enter into easement agreements.

**Priority new actions:** DNRP is not only working to protect large forested tracts, but is also working with the owners of smaller forest acreages that experience strong pressure to convert forest to urban land uses.

---

## Total Acres in Forest Production District

**About this indicator:** Total acreage in the FPD zoning designation is stable while land use patterns within the FPD are subject to change. Population growth puts pressures on the forest industry, as the land becomes more valuable for residential uses and encroaching development makes it more difficult to conduct forestry operations.

**Status:** Currently there are 824,000 acres in the Forest Production District. Of this, 233,400 acres are owned by large commercial interests. This is a decrease of 53,000 acres since 1997.

**Influencing factors:** An analysis of private land ownership changes reveals that forestland in the FPD is gradually being subdivided and sold by large timber companies to smaller individual and commercial ownerships. The smaller parcels are more likely to be developed for residential purposes and not managed for commercial forestry. Government purchases of commercial forestland in the FPD in recent years also have tended to take land out of forest production.

**Priority new actions:** Two proposed 2008 Comprehensive Plan policies address the public land in the FPD. One recognizes the large area of the FPD that is publicly owned, encourages continued forest management on these lands, and directs the County to collaborate with other land managers. The second directs the County to encourage continued private forestry in its acquisition efforts, and directs that acquisitions in the FPD be evaluated to ensure that the long term commercial significance of the FPD is not compromised.

---

## Private — volume of timber harvested (MBF)

**About this indicator:** Timber sale volume is used as an indicator of the general health of the forest industry. Timber harvests vary widely from year to year, and it is difficult to determine whether the overall decrease over the six years of available data represents a trend. It will be valuable to continue to track the data to determine if commercial forestry activity declines over time.

**Status:** In 2007 timber harvested on private land totaled 76.2 million board feet valued at \$30.1 million. This is more volume than in 2006, but less than in 2005 and 2004.

**Influencing factors:** The data show that forest harvest is variable from year to year. Probably the biggest influencing factor in how much timber is harvested in any year is the price of logs, which varies considerably depending on housing markets and other factors. In contrast, the harvest levels on public land are more likely a result of long term plans rather than a response to markets.

---

## Public (non-federal) — volume of timber harvested (MBF)

**About this indicator:** The variation in harvest levels on public land does not follow the trend on private lands. They both vary widely, but do not track each other from year to year.

**Status:** Timber harvests on public lands in King County totaled 26.5 million board feet valued at \$8.3 million in 2007.


**Influencing factors:** A large part of the FPD, sixty-eight percent, is in public ownership, which preserves the forest land base, but does not necessarily contribute to forestry activity. The USDA Forest Service ownership, the Cedar River and Tolt River watersheds owned by the City of Seattle,



the State Natural Resource Conservation Areas, and the King County natural areas, are restrictive in their land management policy, allowing no or very limited forestry activities.

**Priority new actions:** New proposed Comprehensive Plan policies encourage continued forest management on public lands in the FPD and direct that the County's acquisitions of private forestland in the FPD be evaluated to ensure that the long term commercial significance of the FPD is not compromised.

## Technical Notes

 For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

## KingStat

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Land and Resources](#) » Terrestrial Biota



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS      |                  |                 |                                  |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment           | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption             | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Forest Cover & Imperviousness |                  | Agriculture     | Forest Production and Protection |            | Terrestrial Biota      |                       |                         |                  |

### TERRESTRIAL BIOTA

2007 Rating: ☐

**Indicator:** King County's Terrestrial Biota Index is weighted at 10 percent of the entire Land & Resources Index. Mammals, birds, amphibians, and biodiversity should be included in the assessment of wildlife health, but there is no consistently collected data regarding these animals in King County. There is currently no plan to develop a long-term population monitoring program.

**Influencing factors:** Over the past two centuries, increased population and development have substantially altered King County's landscape. Less forests and natural land cover reduce the amount of habitat for animal and plant species. Pollutant runoff, loss of forest cover, wetland ecological health, and of invasive and non-native plants are a few factors that can have an affect on terrestrial biota populations.

**Existing DNRP response:** Although there is no existing population monitoring for terrestrial biota in King County, WLR continues to implement programs focusing on minimizing degradation from development and pollutant runoff from farms, preventing the loss of forest cover, and implementing watershed improvement projects. WLR's capital projects program builds wetland enhancement projects. Basin stewards work with the local community to respond to resident's inquiries for watershed protection, coordinate efforts among diverse public agencies, facilitate watershed project implementation, provide assistance to monitoring programs and provide public education opportunities.

**Priority new actions:** Currently, WLR is working to update the policy on beavers and is developing strategies and actions to address this issue.

**What you can do:** Contact your elected officials and express how important wildlife protections are to you.


More information about King County's Terrestrial Biota is available by continuing to these pages:

- [Beavers](#)
- [King County Biodiversity Report 2008](#)
- [Aquatic Plants](#)
- [Mussels](#)

### Technical Notes

For definitions and more detail.

#### Terrestrial Biota Components



Terrestrial Biota

- ☒ Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- ☐ Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- ☐ Below standard or decline from prior years
- ☐ Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Home & garden hints for healthy streams & salmon

[Be a Salmon Watcher](#)

[Salmon Safe Practices](#)

[Salmon Smart: A Guide to Help People Help Salmon](#)

##### At Work

[Volunteer for a Habitat Restoration Project](#)

#### Related Information

[Salmon and Trout Topics](#)

[Shoreline Parcel Characterization](#)

[Green-Duwamish Habitat Projects](#)

[Clean river for fish and wildlife](#)

[Salmon ladder award](#)

[Toxic Stormwater Threatens Sea Life](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.



**Updated: December 18, 2008**

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

SEARCH  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » Health and Safety



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS     |                  |                         |                      |                     | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment          | Land & Resources | Health & Safety         | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere          | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Safe and clean surface water |                  | Use of parks and trails | Toxic Burdens        | Potable Groundwater |                        |                       |                         |                  |

### HEALTH AND SAFETY

#### About this Indicator

This new indicator summarizes the status of several conditions that contribute to the health and safety of King County residents. These conditions are ones that King County's Department of Natural Resources and Parks seeks to improve through its program and service delivery.

#### Status

Sub-indicators that are exceeding standards and/or are trending positive:

- Access to potable Groundwater on Vashon Island

Sub-indicators that are approaching standards and/or are stable:

- Reducing toxic burdens in children and vulnerable populations
- Utilization rates of parks and trails
- Access to clean and safe surface waters

#### Influencing factors

Many broad societal and economic factors, as well as individual decisions, bear on conditions that affect the health and safety of King County residents.

Utilizations rates of parks and trails are affected by weather, the team sport programs of school districts, and the popularity of private facilities and programs that serve local residents.

The toxic burdens to children and vulnerable populations in our communities are influenced by national and state laws, product design decisions of consumer product manufacturers, and exposure levels that vary by household.

Access to clean and safe surface waters of streams, rivers, lakes and marine waters are influenced by decisions of households and local businesses, federal and state policies, and legacies of prior industrial activities.


#### DNRP response

The Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP) has a range of innovative programs underway to combat exposure to and build-up of toxic substances in humans and the environment. LHWMP is focusing its efforts to increase

- the protection of King County's most vulnerable residents by:

#### 2007 Rating

##### Health & Safety Components



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Shoreline Practices for a Healthy Lake, River or Stream

Embrace Natural Yard Care

Home & garden hints for healthy streams & salmon

##### At Work

Reduce your runoff, get a fee discount

Learn Best Practices to reduce Stormwater Pollution

Erosion Control for Construction Sites

Apply Integrated Pest Management in your landscaping

#### Related Information

King County Watersheds

Salmon and Trout Topics

Shoreline Master Program

Streams Water Quality Monitoring Data

Groundwater data

Normative Flow Studies

Interactive Hydrography Map

EPA: Lower Duwamish Watershed

- Working 'upstream' to reduce the production of hazardous wastes and materials;
- Facilitating 'product stewardship' policies and programs; and
- Enhancing hazardous waste management capacities and responsibilities

To improve access to clean and safe surface waters, DNRP is:

- improving facilities which convey and treat wastewater
- partnering with other jurisdictions to promote stewardship of land and water
- reaching out to land owners and land managers with technical assistance and education

To increase utilization of parks and trails, DNRP is:

- Expanding and improving the Regional Trail System
- Partnering with community organizations to expand and improve facilities for passive and active recreation
- Improve maintenance levels at existing park facilities

## What you can do

- Minimize your impact to surface waters by driving less, cleaning up pet waste, and improving yard care practices.
- Reduce toxic burdens through environmentally-preferable purchasing decisions, eating lower on the food chain, and reducing your exposure to house dust and other environmental contaminants.
- Protect groundwater through water conservation and improving yard care and land management practices.

More information about King County's Health & Safety indicators is available by continuing to these indicators:

- [Access to Clean & Safe Surface Water](#)
  - [Freshwater Environment \(Lakes\)](#)
  - [Marine Environment](#)
- [Utilization of Parks & Trails](#)
- [Reduced Toxic Burdens in Children / Vulnerable Populations](#)
- [Access to Potable Groundwater](#)

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.  
[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

SEARCH  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Health and Safety](#) » Safe and clean surface water



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS     |                  |                         |                      |                     | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment          | Land & Resources | Health & Safety         | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere          | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Safe and clean surface water |                  | Use of parks and trails | Toxic Burdens        | Potable Groundwater |                        |                       |                         |                  |

### ACCESS TO SAFE AND CLEAN SURFACE WATER

**About this indicator:** King County's Access to Clean and Safe Surface Water Index includes information about the conditions of water quality at freshwater and marine environments. Our weighting system applies 60% of freshwater environment and 40% percent of marine environment results toward the overall index. Within the Freshwater Environment Index (lakes only), our weighting system applies 70 percent of fecal bacteria at large lake swimming beaches, 20 percent of cyanobacteria in large lakes, and 10 percent of toxic algae watch program in lakes towards the index. Within the Marine Environment Index, our weighting system applies 100 percent of fecal bacteria at marine beaches towards the index.

**Status:** Overall, conditions were approaching near-standard, with a few areas of lesser concern (toxic algal blooms) and other areas of more concern (fecal bacteria at marine swimming beaches).

**Influencing factors:** Fecal coliform bacteria can enter lakes, streams and Puget Sound from untreated wastewater effluent, household or farm animals, wildlife, storm water runoff, sewage overflows or failing septic systems. Increased temperatures due to regional climate changes, coupled with increased watershed development and nutrients, may lead to increased cyanobacteria blooms and possible toxin production. Cyanobacteria populations are known to increase with increased nutrients in the lake.

#### What you can do:


- Properly dispose of or manage pet and livestock wastes.
- Minimize the use of fertilizers and pesticides by practicing natural yard care.
- Wash your car on the grass or gravel instead of on the street or driveway, or take it to a car wash.
- Report algal blooms on lakes.

More information about King County's Access to Clean and Safe Surface Water is available by continuing below for these measures:


- [Fecal Bacteria at Large Lakes Swimming Beaches](#)
- [Routine Cyanobacteria Toxicity Testing at Large Lakes](#)
- [Toxic Algae Watch Program at all Lakes](#)

2007 Rating:

#### Access to Clean & Safe Surface Water Components



#### Access to Clean & Safe Surface Water Components



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Shoreline Practices for a Healthy Lake, River or Stream

Embrace Natural Yard Care

Home & garden hints for healthy streams & salmon

Duwamish River Cleanup Coalition

##### At Work

Reduce your runoff, get a fee discount

Learn Best Practices to reduce Stormwater Pollution

Erosion Control for Construction Sites

Apply Integrated Pest Management in your landscaping

#### Related Information

King County Watersheds

Salmon and Trout Topics

Shoreline Master Program

Streams Water Quality Monitoring Data

Groundwater data

Normative Flow Studies

Interactive Hydrography Map

## Fecal Bacteria at Large Lakes Swimming Beaches

**About this indicator:** When fecal coliform bacteria are found in lake waters it indicates a higher probability that the water has been contaminated with fecal material from humans, birds or other animals. Although fecal coliform bacteria themselves are usually not harmful, they often occur with other disease-causing bacteria so their presence indicates the potential for pathogens to be present that are a risk to human health.


**Status:** High bacterial counts at several beaches monitored in Lake Washington (Juanita, Magnusson Off Leash Park, Gene Coulon, and Meydenbauer) during the 2007 summer season resulted in swimming beach closures. Bacteria levels were low in Green Lake for the fifth year in a row while Lake Sammamish remained fairly consistent, with slight variability from year to year. The 2008 target and long-term outcome for swimming beaches on large lakes is that none of the testing sites violate both parts of the Washington Department of Health fecal coliform bacteria target which is a geometric mean of 200 colonies per 100 ml with no single sample exceeding 1000 colonies per 100 ml.

**Influencing factors:** Fecal coliform bacteria can enter lakes from untreated wastewater effluent, household or farm animals, wildlife, storm water runoff, sewage overflows or failing septic systems. The most impacted beaches are adjacent to streams draining urbanized watersheds.


**Existing DNRP response:** King County routinely monitors swimming beaches from mid-May through mid-September to determine levels of bacterial pollution and works with Public Health Seattle & King County to estimate relative human health risks. If bacterial counts at swimming beach testing sites have a geomean greater than 200 colonies per 100 ml of water or have a single sample greater than 1000 colonies per 100 ml, the beach will be temporarily closed.

**Priority new actions:** Identification and correction of sewer leaks, changes to park maintenance procedures and control of non-migratory, non-native waterfowl should reduce bacteria contributed from waterfowl and improve the water quality at large lake swimming beaches. Efforts to identify and correct bacterial source in the urban streams that discharge adjacent to swimming beaches continues. A TMDL for bacteria in Thornton Creek has been started and a TMDL for Juanita Creek is planned.


**Green Lake - percent of samples from all sites that met the target of both parts of criteria (geomean <200, no samples > 1000 cfu/100 ml)**




**Lake Sammamish - percent of samples from all sites that met the target of both parts of criteria (geomean <200, no samples > 1000 cfu/100 ml)**



**Lake Washington - percent of samples from all sites that met the target of both parts of criteria (geomean <200, no samples > 1000 cfu/100 ml)**







### Fecal Bacteria at Large Lakes Swimming Beaches

2007 Findings

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

## Routine Cyanobacteria Toxicity Testing in Large Lakes

**About this indicator:** King County wants to maintain the safety of lakes for all beneficial uses. Certain species of freshwater cyanobacteria (bluegreen "algae") are known to make toxins occasionally that are potentially harmful to mammals when ingested. Smaller-bodied animals drinking directly from affected water bodies are particularly at risk, and there are records of pet deaths in Washington State related directly to contact and ingestion of algae blooms.


Washington State standards for potential harmful levels of cyanotoxins are currently under development. A State draft guidance level of 6 µg/L for the toxin microcystin has been proposed as a warning level for possible health risks to the public from contact with lake water. Thresholds for several other known toxins are currently under study.

Since 2003 the Major Lakes Monitoring Program has routinely monitored open water and swimming beaches in lakes Washington, Sammamish, and Union for the presence of the cyanotoxin microcystin. When blooms are observed they are also sampled for toxin analysis.

Our indicator applies equal weighting to all three large lakes; lakes Sammamish, Washington, and Union. This environmental indicator is represented as a percent of the total samples collected at each lake having microcystin results less than the State draft guidance level.

**Status:** Over the last five years only one sample,

### Cyanobacteria toxicity tests on Lake Union



■ Samples less than the MDL  
■ Samples less than the State Draft Guidance Level



Note:  
 n = number of samples  
 MDL = method detection limit (0.05 µg/L) for microcystin  
 State Draft Guidance Level = WA State Draft guidance level (6 µg/L) of microcystin


collected from a bloom on Lake Washington in 2006, exceeded the State draft guidance level of 6 µg/L. In 2007, all samples from lakes Washington, Sammamish and Union were below the State draft guidance level of 6 µg/L.

**Influencing factors:** Cyanobacteria blooms are more frequent in the summer and fall, although they may occur throughout the year. Increased temperatures due to regional climate changes, coupled with increased watershed development and nutrients, may lead to increased cyanobacteria blooms and possible toxin production. Cyanobacteria populations are known to increase with increased nutrients in the lake. Managing nutrient inputs into lakes may reduce the abundance of cyanobacteria and reduce the incidence of cyanobacteria toxicity.

**Existing DNRP response:** Select lake stations and swimming beaches are monitored for cyanobacteria toxicity through the Major Lake Monitoring and Swimming Beach Monitoring programs. Any bloom determined to be above the proposed state threshold will trigger assessment of the health risk posed and possible action to post warnings or close the water body temporarily for use.

**Priority new actions:** Cyanobacteria toxicity monitoring in 2008 was revised to sample more swimming beaches in King County. In addition, continued education of the public through the Lake Stewardship Program and County lake web pages will expand public awareness of cyanobacteria blooms and the resources available to investigate potentially toxicity. In 2009 King County Environmental Laboratory will expand it capacity to offer anatoxin screening in addition to microcystin analysis. Water bodies with repeated dangerous levels of cyanobacteria toxins will be considered for management actions to reduce their incidence if available funds can be identified.





## Toxic Algae Watch at All Lakes


**About this indicator:** King County wants to maintain the safety of lakes for all beneficial uses. Certain species of freshwater cyanobacteria (bluegreen "algae") are known to make toxins occasionally that are potentially harmful to mammals when ingested. Smaller-bodied animals drinking directly from affected water bodies are particularly at risk, and there are records of pet deaths in Washington State related directly to contact and ingestion of algae blooms.

There are no Washington State standards for assessing the potential for harm, but are currently under development. A State draft guidance level of 6 µg/L for the toxin microcystin has been proposed as a warnings level for possible health risks to the public from contact with lake water. Thresholds for several other known toxins are currently under study and may be proposed in the future.

In 2007 the Washington Department of Ecology began a program to assist citizens and local jurisdictions to identify the presence of potentially toxic cyanobacteria blooms and test for microcystins at the King County Environmental Lab. The King County Lake Stewardship Program participates in this program and has trained staff and lake volunteers to report and sample blooms.

This environmental indicator includes all lakes that submitted bloom samples for cyanotoxin testing and is represented as a percent of the 17 total samples tested that had microcystin results less than the State draft guidance level. Samples were only collected if a potential toxic algal bloom was reported through the program.


**Status:** In 2007, at least 50 lakes (large and small) had monitoring programs with participants alerted to look for algal blooms and report their presence. Of these, 10 lakes were observed to have blooms, and 17 samples were tested for microcystins. None of these 17 samples analyzed had concentrations of microcystins above the State draft guidance level of 6 µg/L.



**Influencing factors:** Cyanobacteria blooms are more frequent in late summer through early winter, although they may occur throughout the year. Increased temperatures due to regional climate changes, coupled with increased watershed development and subsequent higher nutrient loading to surface waters, may lead to increased cyanobacteria blooms and possible toxin production. Cyanobacteria populations are known to increase with increased nutrients. Managing nutrient inputs into lakes may reduce the abundance of cyanobacteria and reduce the incidence of cyanobacteria toxicity.

**Existing DNRP response:** King County has established a cooperative relationship with the Department of Ecology Algae Watch Program and will continue to sample all blooms reported through the Lake Stewardship and Trouble Call programs. Any bloom determined to be above the proposed state threshold will trigger assessment of the health risk posed and possible action to post warnings or close the water body temporarily for use.

**Priority new actions:** Continued education of the public through the Lake Stewardship Program and the County lake web pages will expand public awareness of cyanobacteria blooms and the resources available to investigate potentially toxicity. In 2009 King County Environmental Laboratory will expand its capacity to offer anatoxin screening in addition to the microcystin analysis. Water bodies with repeated dangerous levels of cyanobacteria toxins will be considered for management actions to reduce their incidence if available funds can be identified.



#### Toxic Algae Watch at All Lakes

2007 Findings

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

## Fecal Bacteria at Marine Beaches


**About this indicator:** Fecal coliforms are one of many groups of bacteria that indicate the presence of fecal contamination at swimming beaches. The State of Washington's water quality regulatory standards indicate that organism counts should not exceed a geometric mean value of 14 colony-forming units (CFU) per 100 ml, and not more than 10 percent of the samples used to calculate the geometric mean should exceed 43 CFU per 100 ml. These standards are known as the geo-mean standard and the peak standard, respectively.

Comparison to both the geo-mean and peak standard are made for each beach site monitored and

reported for this indicator, using fecal coliform counts from samples collected on a monthly basis from 13 sites in 2007. The geo-mean value reflects the typical fecal coliform count at a given site, while the peak value is used to determine whether pulses of high fecal coliform counts may be present at a site.

**Status:** During 2007, two of the 13 sites monitored (15 percent) met both the geo-mean and peak standards for all 12 sampling events. Eight of the 13 sites (62 percent) met the geo-mean standard for all 12 sampling events, but did not meet the peak standard one or more times. Three of the 13 sites (23 percent) did not meet either the geo-mean or peak standards one or more times. The three stations that failed both the geomean and peak standards one or more times were located near Alki Point, Golden Gardens, and Carkeek Park. Sites with any type of standard failure are shown on the map by the red circled X.


Percent of beach sites that meet the fecal coliform bacteria standards



**Influencing factors:** Fecal coliform concentrations measured at marine beach sites are highly influenced by proximity to fresh water inputs, especially during rainfall events. During 2007, the majority of peak standard exceedances at all stations occurred following significant rainfall events during March, July, and December.

**Existing DNRP response:** Past and on-going efforts by King County have reduced fecal contamination from most outfalls to the point that contributions from non point sources in the area are more significant than the outfalls themselves. DNRP has little control on improving current levels of fecal coliforms near most outfall sites. An exception to this is the Vashon outfall where recent improved maintenance and operations have reduced bacteria entering the environment and an upgrade to the outfall itself (moving it further out into deeper water) should further reduce fecal contamination on nearby beaches. The beach monitoring station at Gorsuch Creek on Vashon Island is near the Vashon Treatment Plant and outfall and is monitored as part of the outfall lease with the Washington State Department of Natural Resources. This monitoring station failed the geo-mean standard 3 out of 12 months and the peak standard once in 2006. This station, in 2007, passed both the geo-mean and peak standards during all 12 months.

**Priority new actions:** DNRP will pursue efforts to determine sources of non-point source contributions of fecal coliforms. These efforts will include evaluating emerging technologies in microbial source tracking, and the continued application of fecal coliform survey projects, such as the one performed at Alki Point. Source tracking projects, such as the one performed at Alki Point may also be undertaken at Golden Gardens in 2008, to evaluate potential sources of fecal pollution at this site. King County added 13 new beach monitoring stations for the 2007 sampling year. Sufficient data will have been collected at these 13 stations by the end of 2008 to begin calculating and reporting geo-mean and peak standard information.



## Fecal Bacteria at Marine Beaches

2007 Findings

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

## Technical Notes

[+](#) For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County





King County  
Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

**SEARCH**  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Health and Safety](#) » Use of parks and trails



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS     |                  |                         |                      |                     | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment          | Land & Resources | Health & Safety         | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere          | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Safe and clean surface water |                  | Use of parks and trails | Toxic Burdens        | Potable Groundwater |                        |                       |                         |                  |

### USE OF PARKS AND TRAILS

2007 Rating:

**About this indicator:** This is a new indicator to look at utilization trends of recreation facilities and programs. Originally conceived to analyze scheduling trends of park facilities, data provided contradictions in what is understood in recreation trends. In order to report on trends a more robust analysis is required and is queued up for 2008 that will include data from public and private facility managers, and sports leagues. This data will be analyzed with multiple demographic layers to better understand what drives upward and downward trends in utilization of recreation facilities and programs.

**Status:** Initial findings reveal that baseball and swimming reservations at some park facilities in the county have declined from 2005 to 2007, while soccer as increased. However, the data collected is inadequate to make broader trend statements.


**Influencing factors:** Some influencing factors that resulted in a decrease in utilization include fee increases and poor facility conditions. Analyzing a fuller recreational inventory with broader list of recreational providers should allow us to address influencing factors and speak to trends with more confidence.

**Existing DNRP response:** Some efforts to improve the trend in utilization include converting athletic fields to lit synthetic turf, continuing to offer sports grant programs that improve facilities and directing capital resources to geographic areas where there are deficits in recreation facilities.

**Priority new actions:** In addition to continuing the efforts noted above, other actions to be taken to better understand and improve utilization rates will include working with cities and recreation providers such as the YMCA, and Boys and Girls Club to assess membership and identify hindrances to increased membership. This will result in a richer understanding of where resources should be spent to meet recreational needs. Both the Youth Sports Facility Grant and Community Partnerships and Grants Programs are likely solutions to meeting this need.

[Back to top](#)

Utilization of Parks & Trails Components



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Shoreline Practices for a Healthy Lake, River or Stream

Embrace Natural Yard Care

##### At Work

Reduce your runoff, get a fee discount

Learn Best Practices to reduce Stormwater Pollution

Apply Integrated Pest Management in your landscaping

#### Related Information

[Regional trail equity information](#)

[Lake Topics](#)

[King County Watersheds](#)

[Salmon and Trout Topics](#)

[Shoreline Master Program](#)

[Major Lake Data](#)

[Interactive Hydrography Map](#)

[Small Lake Monitoring Data](#)

[Shoreline Master Plan Updated](#)

[Lake Washington's Ecosystem](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.



[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County

Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)


☐ Search this section

 You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Health and Safety](#) » Toxic Burdens


print

## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS   |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment  | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Safe and clean surface water   Use of parks and trails   Toxic Burdens   Potable Groundwater |                  |                 |                      |            |                        |                       |                         |                  |

## REDUCED TOXIC BURDENS IN CHILDREN / VULNERABLE POPULATIONS

2007 Rating:

**About this indicator:** As a place-holder until such time as local data are available, this indicator is derived from 5 high-risk chemicals measured in the U.S. population by the Centers for Disease Control. "NHANES" data are extracted for the following key chemicals, for which we have reduction efforts underway or being initiated in the King County area:

- Lead
- Mercury
- Phthalate plasticizers
- Bisphenol-A
- Organophosphate pesticides

Equal weighting is given at this time. Subsequent enhancements could be derived from the Washington State Department of Health's "Washington Environmental Public Health Tracking Network," currently under development, which will report local data on lead in children and adults, organophosphate and carbamate pesticides in exposed workers, and other chemicals in the future.


**Status:** Little data specific to King County forces us, at this time, to look to national and state data as place holders.

**Influencing factors:** Exposures to hazardous chemicals come from a wide variety of sources, starting in the womb from mothers' own body burdens, to foods, food containers, dust, old paint, carpets and many other products and materials. It is a very complex area, yet one we should be concerned about when we see elevated chemical levels in tests of blood, urine, bone or other tissues. Even in the face of scientific uncertainty, it behooves us to reduce such body burdens of known problem chemicals to the extent possible.

**Existing DNRP response:** Complementary with King County's extensive work on reduction of hazardous chemicals in the environment, we are concerned about exposures of our population to chemicals that are known to cause health and well-being problems, such as lead, mercury and other priority toxins. In particular, Public Health efforts have focused on elevated blood lead in children. Local Hazardous Waste Management Program priorities include lead, mercury, bisphenol-A, and certain pesticides including the organophosphates. In addition to finding ways for individuals to reduce their and their children's exposures, efforts include policy changes at the local and state level to eliminate these chemicals in new products and to safely remove older materials.

**Priority new actions:** Initiatives in the state legislature have aimed at further reductions in mercury-containing products, and establishment of a manufacturer-funded product stewardship system for the safe take-back of mercury-containing products at the end of their useful lives. Work continues to address the chronic exposure to lead in old paint and the dust in older homes, including pending federal guidelines that would further enhance work done by any remodeling or other disturbance that might release more lead from old paint into the home environment. The extent of lead exposures from

## Reduced Toxic Burdens in Children/ Vulnerable Populations



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

## WHAT CAN YOU DO?

## At Home

Properly dispose of Household Hazardous Waste

Check for and repair failed septic systems

Install Rain Barrels at home

## At Work

Properly dispose of Hazardous Waste

Water irrigation

Don't Flush the Planet

Saving Water

## Related Information

Take-it-Back stores equity information

King County Watersheds

King County Groundwater Management

Interactive Groundwater Map

A Survey of Ditches on County Roads For Their Potential to Affect Storm Runoff Water Quality

On-Site Runoff Mitigation with Rooftop Rainwater Collection and Use

Agricultural Waterways in King County

Environmental

other sources such as ceramic glazes and candies is being explored. Lead and phthalates in toys and other products widely used by children are addressed in legislation pending in the Washington Legislature. Research is underway to better understand exposures to bisphenol-A, an estrogenic chemical found to leach out of polycarbonate plastics and other resins. Efforts to reduce and/or eliminate remaining uses of organophosphate pesticides continue.

#### What you can do:

- Choose products that do not contain these hazardous chemicals, where possible.
- If living in a home built or painted before the late 1970s, reduce exposure to dusts.
- Seek certified contractors to assist with removal of lead paint when doing any reconstruction or when dealing with peeling surfaces.
- Follow Integrated Pest Management and Natural Yard Care practices to minimize pesticide use.
- Safely dispose of old household hazardous wastes through local collection services.
- Contact your elected officials and express how important reduction of exposure to high-hazard chemicals is, especially to young children.

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Limitations to  
Vegetation  
Establishment and  
Growth in Vegetated  
Stormwater Biofilters

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.  
[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

SEARCH  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Health and Safety](#) » Potable Groundwater



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS     |                  |                         |                      |                     | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment          | Land & Resources | Health & Safety         | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere          | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Safe and clean surface water |                  | Use of parks and trails | Toxic Burdens        | Potable Groundwater |                        |                       |                         |                  |

### ACCESS TO POTABLE GROUNDWATER

2007 Rating:

#### Nitrates in Groundwater on Vashon-Maury Islands

**About this indicator:** King County has been tracking groundwater quality on Vashon-Maury Island since 2001. Nitrate is used to track groundwater quality because it is a good indicator of changes caused by human activities, such as land-use development. King County's goal is to ensure high water quality through effective land-use and on-site septic regulations.

The groundwater quality indicator uses a nitrate index, defined as the maximum concentration of the annual sampling results divided by the maximum contaminant level (MCL) of Nitrate (10 mg/L). This method yields one number. The closer this index gets to 1 (or over 1) the greater concern. The nitrate index has been less than 0.5 since 2003.

**Status:** Of the 19 well/spring sites monitored, all have tested below the drinking water standard (Maximum Contaminant Level, MCL of 10 mg/L) and all have less than 5 mg per liter of nitrate present. Less than half the sites tested have seen above average nitrate increases since testing began.

**Influencing factors:** Poor drainage systems, improperly maintained septic systems and improper fertilizer use can increase nitrate levels.

**Existing DNRP response:** King County plans to continue monitoring Vashon's wells and springs annually for nitrate concentrations.

**Priority new actions:** Additional locations have been sought to increase our understanding of island aquifers. King County intends to produce Vashon-Maury Island-wide water table, contour maps with seasonal variability that will be reported every year.


#### Access to Potable Groundwater



Nitrates in Groundwater (Vashon-Maury Islands)

- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### Groundwater nitrate index



#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Properly dispose of Household Hazardous Waste

Check for and repair failed septic systems

Install Rain Barrels at home

##### At Work

Properly dispose of Hazardous Waste

Water irrigation

Don't Flush the Planet

Saving Water

#### Related Information

King County Watersheds

King County Groundwater Management

Interactive Groundwater Map

A Survey of Ditches on County Roads For Their Potential to Affect Storm Runoff Water Quality

On-Site Runoff Mitigation with Rooftop Rainwater Collection and Use

Agricultural Waterways in King County

Environmental Limitations to Vegetation



### Access To Potable Groundwater

2007 Findings

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

## Technical Notes

[+](#) For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

SEARCH  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » Resource Consumption



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Energy use               | Solid waste      | Green Building  |                      |            |                        |                       |                         |                  |

### RESOURCE CONSUMPTION

#### About this Indicator

King County's Resource Consumption Indicator addresses trends in residential solid waste disposal and recycling and green building practices for residential and commercial development. In the future, DNRP intends to include data on building energy use in King County; however we do not currently have a reliable source for this data.

#### Status

Green building in the commercial sector has improved, as shown by the increased number of completed projects that have been certified as LEED buildings by the US Green Building Council. LEED stands for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design and is a nationally recognized commercial green building rating system. Residential green building in King County is measured by the number of BuiltGreen homes completed the county. In 2007, residential green building levels fell short of expectations.

Targets as established in the King County Solid Waste Comprehensive Plan for both solid waste recycling and disposal were met in 2007.

#### Influencing factors

Green building and solid waste management practices are influenced by a range of economic and social factors. Solid waste disposal levels have historically increased in prosperous times. The recent downturn in the economy may have contributed to reductions in solid waste disposal levels and well as in the reduced numbers of completed BuiltGreen homes.

Market factors are also contributors to the increased numbers of LEED certified commercial buildings in King County, as market analysis has shown that demand for these buildings is increasing in this region. Increased social awareness of the environmental benefits of recycling as well as increased regulatory requirements for recycling are factors that bear on household recycling rates.

#### DNRP response


Affecting the building, recycling, and disposal behaviors of King County residents requires a range of strategies, from collaborations with cities and non-profit partners to direct outreach to developers and residents. The King County Solid Waste Division delivers recycling and resource conservation education and outreach programs to schools

(<http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/index.aspeducation/index.asp>) and leads the county's Green Building Program, including the GreenTools website:

<http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/index.aspgreenbuilding/>

#### 2007 Rating

##### Resource Consumption Components



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Shoreline Practices for a Healthy Lake, River or Stream

Embrace Natural Yard Care

Home & garden hints for healthy streams & salmon

##### At Work

Reduce your runoff, get a fee discount

Learn Best Practices to reduce Stormwater Pollution

Erosion Control for Construction Sites

Apply Integrated Pest Management in your landscaping

#### Related Information

King County Watersheds

Salmon and Trout Topics

Shoreline Master Program

Streams Water Quality Monitoring Data

Groundwater data

Normative Flow Studies

Interactive Hydrography Map

EPA: Lower Duwamish Watershed

## What you can do:

When considering building or remodeling projects

- [Learn and apply green building practices](#)

When making purchasing decisions, consider environmental impacts

- [Recycle more](#)
- [Dispose of solid waste properly](#)

More information about King County's Resource Consumption indicators is available by continuing to these indicators:

- [Building Energy Use](#)
- [Solid Waste](#)
- [Green Building](#)
  - [Built Green™ Homes \(Residential\) - Green Building](#)
  - [Leadership in Energy Environment \(LEED\) certified Buildings \(Commercial\) - Green Building](#)

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

**Updated: December 18, 2008**

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County





King County  
Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

**SEARCH**  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Resource Consumption](#) » Energy use



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Energy use               | Solid waste      | Green Building  |                      |            |                        |                       |                         |                  |

### ENERGY USE

2007 Rating: ☐

**About this indicator:** This is a 'place holder' for an indicator on building energy use that is currently under development.

Because energy use can have both a large upstream and downstream ecological footprint, it is an important component of the indicator of the resource consumption patterns of King County residents. Much of our household energy use is from (relatively clean) hydro-electric sources, though natural gas is used widely for residential furnaces, hot water tanks, and generating electricity during peak load periods.

If residential building energy use increases in King County, there are upstream impacts associated with water flow in rivers and extracting fossil fuels, and downstream impacts including air and climate pollution. By achieving lower per household energy use (through increasing efficiencies of buildings and appliances), and increasing renewable energy sources, our communities consume fewer resources and have a lighter impact.

King County is not a direct energy provider, and at this time does not have a current data set that depicts residential energy use patterns and trends in King County, but is developing this indicator and maps that show variations in residential energy use by neighborhood type.

**Status:** Residential energy use trends in King County are not yet tracked and reported on in a coordinated manner at this time, though DNRP is exploring ways of looking at both energy consumption and sourcing trends.

**Influencing factors:** A range of factors (that are technical, cultural, economic and political) influence energy use levels in King County homes.

**DNRP response:** King County Solid Waste Division promotes and supports residential green building practices through a partnership with the Master Builders of Snohomish and King Counties and by providing education and technical assistance to homeowners and developers.

**Priority new actions:** King County seeks to further reduce residential energy use by promoting green building practices in single and multi-family residential construction and remodeling.

#### What you can do:

- [Conduct a home energy audit by following the steps outlined in this brochure](#)
- [If remodeling, buying or building a home, seek to achieve the energy points outlined in Built Green](#)

### Technical Notes

#### Energy Use Components



Energy Use

- ☒ Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- ☐ Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- ☐ Below standard or decline from prior years
- ☐ Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Home & garden hints for healthy streams & salmon

Be a Salmon Watcher

##### At Work

Volunteer for a Habitat Restoration Project

#### Related Information

[Salmon and Trout Topics](#)

[Shoreline Parcel Characterization](#)

[Green-Duwamish Habitat Projects](#)

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

**Updated: December 18, 2008**

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County

Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

 **SEARCH**  
☐ Search this section
You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Resource Consumption](#) » Solid waste

print

## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Energy use               | Solid waste      | Green Building  |                      |            |                        |                       |                         |                  |

### SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

2007 Rating:

**About this indicator:** Solid waste (garbage) disposal and recycling rates are telling indicators of resource consumption levels of King County residents. Typically, when residents are buying more consumer products, there are increased levels of garbage being sent to the landfill.

Increased levels of recycling, however, indicate fewer resources are being consumed, as these recycled materials (paper, glass, metals, organic material) remain in circulation.


2007 information about the amount of solid waste disposed per employee per week countywide will not be available until September 2008. Information from 2006 shows that the amount of waste disposed per employee was 25.6 pounds per week, higher than the target of 23.5 pounds per week stated in the county's 2001 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan.

**Status:** King County's 2001 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan includes targets for single family household recycling (54% in 2007) and disposal levels for single family households (27 lbs. per household per week in 2007). These targets were met in 2007, indicating a generally favorable trend in reducing solid waste generation and improving recycling rates.

**Influencing factors:** Economic conditions have a significant influence on consumption levels and therefore solid waste disposal levels. The recent economic downturn has help reduce the amount of consumption and, therefore, the amount of solid waste disposed.

**DNRP response:** In 2007, the King County Solid Waste Division (SWD) worked closely with cities and haulers to increase the availability of food scrap recycling services. The Division also continued the "Recycle More. It's Easy to Do." media campaign which resulted in increased recycling levels.

**Priority new actions:** King County will continue to work with cities to expand organics recycling (food scraps and food-soiled paper in the yard waste recycling) and is advancing food recovery from commercial sources (grocery and restaurants) to food banks or compost. The Solid Waste Division is improving its Web site about food scrap and other recycling and is expanding the types of items accepted for recycling at newly renovated transfer stations.

**Solid Waste Components**

- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Home & garden hints for healthy streams & salmon

Be a Salmon Watcher

##### At Work

Volunteer for a Habitat Restoration Project



#### Related Information

WasteMobile Stop distribution equity information

Salmon and Trout Topics

Shoreline Parcel Characterization

Green-Duwamish Habitat Projects




**What you can do:** Learn more about what you can do to reduce waste and increase recycling through the following resources.

- [Garbage and recycling services](#)
- [Food waste and recycling](#)
- [Yard waste](#)

- [Electronics recycling](#)
- [Fluorescent bulb recycling](#)
- [Appliance recycling](#)
- [Textile recycling](#)
- [Recycling collection events](#)
- [Household hazardous waste collection](#)
- [the Wastemobile](#)
- [Construction recycling](#)
- [Recycling other materials/items](#)
- [On-line materials exchange](#)
- [Green building](#)
- [Eco-consumer tips](#)

## Technical Notes

 For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.  
[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County

Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

 **SEARCH**  
☐ Search this section
You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Resource Consumption](#) » Green Building

## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Energy use               | Solid waste      | Green Building  |                      |            |                        |                       |                         |                  |

### GREEN BUILDING

2007 Rating:


**About this indicator:** This indicator represents the number of houses and commercial buildings being built in King County that meet certain environmental standards. The standards being used are

- For Commercial buildings -- the national Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)® rating system; and
- For residential buildings -- the local Built Green certification program.

The U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) developed the LEED rating system to provide a benchmark for the design, construction and operation of high performance commercial green buildings. LEED recognizes performance in five key areas of human and environmental health: sustainable site development, water savings, energy efficiency, materials selection and indoor environmental quality.

The Built Green program is a partnership between the Master Builder's Association of King and Snohomish Counties, King and Snohomish Counties, and the City of Seattle. New houses and communities building to Built Green standards must meet criteria from the program's checklist, including categories in site and water, energy efficiency, indoor air quality and material selection.

Green building practices are an important indicator of the resource consumption patterns of King County residents because the construction and remodeling of buildings uses many resources and the ongoing operation of buildings continues to consume resources. Additionally, buildings may have both positive and negative ongoing environmental health impacts to building occupants.



#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Home & garden hints for healthy streams & salmon

Be a Salmon Watcher

##### At Work

Volunteer for a Habitat Restoration Project

#### Related Information

[Salmon and Trout Topics](#)

[Shoreline Parcel Characterization](#)

[Green-Duwamish Habitat Projects](#)

### Number of Built Green™ homes certified at the 3- to 5-Star levels in King County

**About This Indicator:** The Built Green program is a partnership between the Master Builder's Association of King and Snohomish Counties, King and Snohomish Counties and the City of Seattle. New houses and communities building to Built Green standards must meet criteria from the program's checklist, including categories in site and water, energy efficiency, indoor air quality and material selection.

**2006 Results:** 3,035.


**2007 Results:** 1,452.

**Influencing Factors:** Due to the economic downturn in the housing market in 2007, the BuiltGreen Program experienced a reduced number of certifications. However, the overall program remains ahead of the original 2001 BuiltGreen business plan target of 10,000 houses certified by 2010.

**Strategy Going Forward:** The Built Green Program plans to phase out the 1- and 2-Star levels by



2010. In addition, King County and Seattle Public Utilities are implementing new grant incentives for building 4-and 5-Star homes.



#### Number of Built Green™ homes in King County

*Click to download the PDF version.*


### Number of buildings in King County achieving a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating

**About this indicator:** This indicator measures represent the number of commercial buildings being built in King County that meet the national Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED®) rating system. The U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) developed the LEED rating system to provide a benchmark for the design, construction and operation of high performance commercial green buildings. LEED recognizes performance in five key areas of human and environmental health: sustainable site development, water savings, energy efficiency, materials selection and indoor environmental quality.

#### 2007 Results: 12

**Influencing Factors:** Green building practices are influenced by incentives, technical assistance, increased consumer demand, and the increases in local companies and practitioners skilled in the design, construction and maintenance of high performing green buildings.

**Strategy Going Forward:** The King County GreenTools green building program offers incentives for developers to achieve LEED certification. In addition, the program offers technical assistance to support the development of more environmentally-friendly and healthy LEED buildings.



## LEED Certified Buildings

2003 — 2006

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

## What you can do

**As a homeowner:** Learn more about purchasing a green home, green home remodeling and maintenance by following up on the following resources:

- [For home energy audits](#)
- [For information about building and remodeling using green materials and practices](#)
- [For purchasing a green home](#)

**As a builder or design professional:** Build your capacity for green design and construction methods by connecting to local professional organizations, such as: the Cascadia Green Building Council or the NW Eco-building Guild

## Technical Notes

⊕ For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County

Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

 **SEARCH**  
☐ Search this section
You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » Atmosphere

## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS                             |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment                                  | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Greenhouse Gas Emissions   Air quality   Temperature |                  |                 |                      |            |                        |                       |                         |                  |


## ATMOSPHERE

2007 Rating

### Indicator

This atmosphere indicator considers greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, mean annual temperature and air quality (air particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>)). The GHG emissions data is from emissions estimates completed by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency. The GHG reduction target was established in the 2007 King County Climate Plan. The scope of the GHG measure is geographic King County — including all of the households, businesses and vehicle travel. The temperature measure shows long term trend data for mean annual air temperature at SEATAC. The air quality measure is for levels of small particulate matter in our air as sampled at monitoring sites across King County.

Atmosphere Components



As you can see from the pie chart, the priority emphasis is on reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. While fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) is our number one air quality concern to protect public health, GHG emissions causing global warming will have unprecedented environmental, social and economic impacts. In fact, global warming is fast becoming the pre-eminent issue of our time both locally and globally. The temperature indicator shows the long term trend of warming in Puget Sound.

Within King County we are expecting a 50 percent loss of snowpack within 50 years. This reduction of snow (and snow-water equivalent) will adversely affect forests, farms, fish, hydropower and drinking water availability. There will be an increase in severe weather patterns causing more intense droughts and floods. There will be an increase in human disease such as West Nile virus from increase in mosquito infestation. Forests will be increasing at risk from Pine Beetle infestation and forest fires, even in wetter Western Washington. Sea level rise will erode coastline and affect infrastructure along our coasts. These are impacts just within King County. Additional impacts across the state, the country and the globe will add additional stresses to our economy and quality of life.

More information about King County's Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Mean Annual Temperature and Air Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) is available by continuing below to these indicators:

- [Green House Gas Emissions](#)
  - [GHG — King County Operational](#)
  - [GHG — DNRP](#)
- [Mean Annual Temperature](#)
- [Air Particulate Matter \(PM<sub>2.5</sub>\)](#)

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures

### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

#### At Home

Use less energy more efficiently

Heat smart with wood stoves and fireplaces

Help Clean the Air Around Puget Sound

#### At Work

Help Employees Bus Commute

Bike Commute

### Related Information

[King County Executive Global Warming Initiative](#)

[2005 Climate Change Conference Results](#)

[Puget Sound Clean Air Agency](#)

[Puget Sound Maritime Air Emissions Projects](#)

[Maritime Pollution in the Puget Sound](#)

[Puget Sound Maritime Air Emissions Study Results](#)

- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.



Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County

Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

KingStat

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

SEARCH  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Atmosphere](#) » Greenhouse Gas Emissions



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS                             |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment                                  | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Greenhouse Gas Emissions   Air quality   Temperature |                  |                 |                      |            |                        |                       |                         |                  |

### GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

#### GHG Emissions for all King County Residents and Businesses

**About this indicator:** Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions such as carbon dioxide and methane are the primary cause of human induced climate change. The GHG emissions Atmosphere Indicator focuses on measuring progress towards reducing all types of GHG emissions from all activities within King County's geographic area. For detailed information about how King County Government is reducing emissions associated with government operations, see the KingStat Climate Protection Performance Measure.

**Drivers:** In King County, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are primarily caused by fossil fuel use (gasoline and diesel) for transportation and to a lesser but significant extent to heat our buildings (natural gas and heating oil). Combusting fossil fuel (e.g. coal) to produce electricity is also a source of GHG emissions, although in King County, because of the prevalence of hydropower, this is less of a source than in many other regions.


**Status:** As of 2002, the King County region (all residents and businesses) produced approximately 23 million metric tons of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) equivalents annually. This is about one quarter of Washington State's emissions and roughly 0.3% of the United States' emissions. GHG emissions in Washington State decreased slightly from 2000 to 2003. This trend also very likely occurred in King County, although to a lesser degree. Many analysts attributed this trend to significant energy price swings during this period. Since 2004, the state's emissions have been on the rise.

However, there are important reasons for optimism. For example, the City of Seattle (which is responsible for roughly 30% of King County's overall emissions) reported emissions in 2005 to be 8% below 1990 levels. They attribute this reduction to several factors, such as offsetting the emissions generated by Seattle City Light's electricity production through innovative emissions reduction projects. They also report that conservation efforts, in conjunction with many residential and commercial users switching from heating oil to lower carbon intensity natural gas, contributed to this progress.

Despite these successes, transportation related GHG emissions in King County continue to rise; this


2007 Rating: ↓

Atmosphere indicators – GHG emissions



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

King County Community Greenhouse Gas Emissions  
23,000,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e



#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

- Use less energy more efficiently
- Heat smart with wood stoves and fireplaces
- Calculate your GHG Emissions
- Reduce Your GHG Emissions
- Develop Density

##### At Work

- Help Employees Bus Commute
- Bike Commute

#### Related Information

- King County Executive Global Warming Initiative
- 2005 Climate Change Conference Results
- Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
- Biodiesel Buses
- King County Global Warming Action Plan
- Green house emmissions challenge
- Northwest Natural Yard Days
- Puget Sound Clean Air Agency's climate protection information



trend, evident in several reports, illustrates the significant challenge that King County is facing to reduce its emissions. Additionally, total energy usage in King County, as reported by Puget Sound Energy and Seattle City Light, has increased over the last several years.

#### **GHG Reduction Goals for the King County Region:**

- Cool Counties Climate Stabilization Initiative, as described in
  - Collaborate with local communities to stop the increase of countywide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 2010
  - Collaborate with local communities to reduce countywide GHG emissions by 80 percent below 2007 emissions by 2050
- Washington Law, as described by ESSB 2815, effective 6/12/2008
  - By 2020, reduce overall emissions of GHGs in the state to 1990 levels
  - By 2035, reduce emissions to 25% below 1990 levels
  - By 2050, reduce emissions to 50% below 1990 levels

**Existing response:** The King County Executive's Office developed the 2007 King County Climate Plan which addresses both community (regional) and corporate (organizational) GHG emissions. The actions to reduce climate pollution are aimed at using the county's four levers of change: land use, transportation, environmental management and renewable energy. In February 2008, the annual update of the climate report was released, highlighting progress that has been made in the past year. Some actions that relate most directly to reducing King County's regional emissions are:

- Addition of greenhouse gas emissions to the environmental review of projects undergoing environmental review mandated by the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), including the county's own developments
- Implementation of over 56,000 new hours of service as part of the Transit Now! Initiative, which is connecting high-density communities to new streamlined bus routes
- Production of the draft 2008 Comprehensive Plan Update, which includes important policies that support climate change mitigation and adaptation
- Update of the county's Green Building Ordinance and progress on county projects that employ higher standards of green building
- Purchase of significant amounts of biofuels by King County's Transit, Wastewater and Solid Waste divisions
- Approval of a contract for conversion of methane from the King County Solid Waste Division landfill to usable energy

Please note, the above actions are those actions that are most relevant to reducing regional GHG emissions. For more specifics about how emissions from King County's governmental operations are being addressed, see the KingStat Climate Protection Performance Measure.

#### **Priority new actions for 2008:**

- Continue development of proposed mitigation thresholds for SEPA-reviewed projects
- Continue collaboration with other governments, universities and the private sector on issues such as greenhouse gas emissions modeling for regional projects, reduction of vehicle miles traveled, encouragement of electrified transportation, broader establishment of fueling infrastructure for clean vehicles, continued development of a regional market for clean vehicles, and improved evaluation of landfill sequestration of greenhouse gas emissions
- Continue work on ways to develop "green collar" jobs in King County
- Continue support of statewide dialogue on climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies
- Advocate for establishment of sound United States federal climate policy as soon as possible, through such venues as the Cool Counties Initiative

## **Technical Notes**

 For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.



Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Atmosphere](#) » Air quality



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS                             |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment                                  | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Greenhouse Gas Emissions   Air quality   Temperature |                  |                 |                      |            |                        |                       |                         |                  |

### AIR QUALITY

2007 Rating:

#### Air Particulate Matter (PM 2.5)

**About this indicator:** Fine particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter (PM2.5) contributes to increased respiratory disease, decreased lung function, heart problems, and premature death. PM2.5 is a main air pollutant of concern in the Puget Sound region.

**Drivers/influencing factors:** The greatest contributing source to PM2.5 in the Puget Sound area is wood smoke, especially from fireplaces and woodstoves, in winter months when PM2.5 concentrations are highest. While wood smoke contributes the greatest mass of PM2.5, particulate matter from diesel engines is the most highly toxic.

**Status:** In 2007, readings at several King County monitoring sites exceeded the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency's PM2.5 health goal of 25 micrograms per cubic meter. Concentrations at some of these sites were not far below the federal daily standard of 35 grams per cubic meter. Measurements taken at these sites are affected by a variety of sources, including wood smoke, vehicles exhaust, industrial activity, and port operations.

**Existing response:** The Puget Sound Clean Air Agency has several programs designed to reduce PM2.5 emissions, including programs specifically targeted to address wood smoke. The agency enforces burn bans in winter months, when weather conditions contribute to high PM2.5 levels. The agency and its partners perform outreach and education to encourage people to use cleaner burning practices and upgrade older wood-burning stoves and fireplaces. Other programs include evaluating and expanding the areas where outdoor burning is prohibited and the agency's Diesel Solutions program, to reduce diesel engine emissions through voluntary, incentive-based projects.

**Priority new actions:** The Puget Sound Clean Air Agency will embark on a comprehensive review of its wood smoke programs in 2008 to determine measures that can be taken to further reduce PM2.5 emissions locally and regionally. Among other measures, this review will examine the feasibility of implementing an existing Seattle-King County ordinance requiring older, dirtier-burning woodstoves be replaced when homes in urban areas are sold. Additionally, the agency will be exploring possible funding sources to expand its efforts in diesel emissions reductions beyond public fleets.

Atmosphere indicators - fine particulate matter



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

Use less energy more efficiently

Heat smart with wood stoves and fireplaces

Cascade Bicycle Club

EPA air quality frequently asked questions

##### At Work

Help Employees Bus Commute

Bike Commute

#### Related Information

[Puget Sound Clean Air Agency](#)

[General information on fine particulate matter](#)

[Information on diesel emissions reductions](#)


[The Puget Sound Clean Air Agency's Annual Data Summary \(2005\)](#)

[How can I help clean our air?](#)



[Information on wood smoke and health effects](#)

[How are ports and partners reducing emissions?](#)

**PM<sub>2.5</sub> Daily for King County;  
3-year average of the 98th  
percentile of daily concentrations  
(reference and continuous methods)**



**Number of days per year with  
air particulates above health  
goal (Lower number is better)**



## Air Particulate Matter

2007 Findings

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

## Technical Notes

For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.



Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.  
[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

## KingStat

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Environmental Indicators](#) » [Atmosphere](#) » Temperature



## INDICATORS - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS                             |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment                                  | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Greenhouse Gas Emissions   Air quality   Temperature |                  |                 |                      |            |                        |                       |                         |                  |

### TEMPERATURE

2007 Rating:

#### Mean Annual Temperature

**About this indicator:** This indicator is the average of the last ten years' annual temperature in King County as measured at the Seattle-Tacoma (SEATAC) airport compared to the historical average temperature (the average from 1949 to present). This indicator is chosen as a rough proxy to track the impact of global warming and climate change at the regional level.

**Drivers/influencing factors:** Many climatic factors control changes in annual temperatures. For example, cyclic and natural changes in oceanic sea surface temperatures can result in persistent weather patterns such as El Nino and La Nina that can last from months to years. In King County, La Nina weather patterns, for example, usually result in cooler and wetter than average weather conditions. In addition to natural causes of climate variability, human caused climate change caused by greenhouse gas emissions (such as carbon dioxide) are a very strong control on global and local climate. Because there is significant year to year variability in average temperature, and because this indicator is focused on measuring the human caused impact on regional climate, a 10 year average temperature is used.

**Status:** The year 2007 was 10th warmest year for the contiguous U.S., since national records began in 1895. Overall, six of the 10 warmest years on record for the contiguous U.S. have occurred since 1998, part of a three decade period in which mean temperatures for the contiguous U.S. have risen at a rate near 0.6°F per decade.

At SEATAC, in 2007, the mean annual air temperature was 54.4 °F, the average annual temperature for the last ten years was 52.3 °F, and the long term average was 51.8 °F. This data indicates that the trends observed at SEATAC are consistent with U.S. and national trends of a warming and changing climate system.

Atmosphere indicators -  
Mean annual temperatures



- Meets/exceeds standard or improved from prior years
- Approaching standard or steady with prior years
- Below standard or decline from prior years
- Insufficient data at this time

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

##### At Home

- Use less energy more efficiently
- Heat smart with wood stoves and fireplaces
- Calculate your GHG Emissions
- Reduce Your GHG Emissions
- Develop Density

##### At Work


- Help Employees Bus Commute
- Bike Commute

#### Related Information


- King County Executive Global Warming Initiative
- 2005 Climate Change Conference Results
- Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
- Biodiesel Buses
- King County Global Warming Action Plan
- Green house emmissions challenge
- Northwest Natural Yard Days
- Puget Sound Clean Air Agency's climate protection information




**Mean annual temperatures in King County**



**Mean annual temperatures at SEATAC Airport**



- |                           |                  |
|---------------------------|------------------|
| Seattle Tacoma WSCMO AP   | Snoqualmie Falls |
| Seattle WB City           | Greenwater       |
| Seattle urban site        | Palmer 3 SE      |
| Seattle Naval Air Station | Landsburg        |
| Seattle Jackson Park      | Kent             |
| Cedar Lake                |                  |



## Mean annual temperature

2007 Findings  
[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

**SEARCH**  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » Performance Measures



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |


### DNRP 2007 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

2007 Rating:

These measures present the degree that DNRP programs are achieving their stated targets. Because of the breadth of DNRP programs, the department's goals and performance measures address topics that are environmental, social and fiscal in nature.

DNRP distinguishes between environmental indicators and performance measures based on the degree of the agency's influence. Measures that have many contributing factors are included as indicators, while measures that are strongly influenced by DNRP policies, programs, and practices are considered performance measures.

#### Goal Results Summary



- Meets or exceeds target
- Approaches target
- Needs improvement
- Insufficient data at this time

#### Related Information

[DNRP Annual Report](#)  
[Natural Resource Lands](#)  
[Solid Waste Recycling](#)

### Performance Measures

DNRP organizes performance measures under its four goal areas:


- Environmental Quality
- Sustainable Resources
- Productive Partnerships
- Price of Service


Under each goal are four to six objectives, or roll-up measures, each of which has a pie chart for a quick summary of performance in this area. Below the summary/roll-ups are details of individual measures and, where relevant, technical notes with specific information about data sources or anomalies with the measure information.

Results on DNRP performance measures use a simple red/yellow/green/gray designation, where:


- Green signifies meeting or exceeding a stated target;
- Yellow signifies results within 10 percent of the target;
- Red signifies the need for improvement; and
- Gray signifies insufficient data at this time.

### DNRP 2007 PERFORMANCE MEASURES






## SUSTAINABLE RESOURCES




## PRODUCTIVE PARTNERSHIPS



## PRICE OF SERVICE





## PERFORMANCE MEASURES

### KEY

- Meets or Exceeds Target
- Approaching Target
- Needs Improvement
- Insufficient Data at this Time

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » Environmental Services



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                      |                                | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                            |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere                     | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships    | Price of Service |
| Regional Trail Access    |                  | Flood Safety    |                      | Land and Resource Conservation |                        | Capital Investment    | Facility/permit compliance |                  |

### ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

2007 Rating:

This roll-up measure summarizes the degree DNRP is achieving its **Environmental Quality goal**:

*Deliver high quality environmental services that protect and restore the environment, enhance our community, and protect public health and safety.*

#### 2007 results

DNRP's rating for the performance measures that support this goal is yellow — signifying results are within 10 percent of target for this goal.

Areas under this goal where DNRP performed well:

- Flood Safety Program Advancement
- Land and Resource Conservation

Areas under this goal where DNRP performance approaches target:

- Permit and Facility Compliance
- Residents living within 1.5 miles of the regional trail network

Areas under this goal where DNRP performance needs improvement:

- Capital Investment Milestone Completion

#### Key influencing factors

The Elected Leadership in King County and the Water and Resources Division made great strides forward in 2007 with the creation of the King County Flood Control Zone District and the adoption of a comprehensive flood risk reduction plan.


Land and resource conservation targets were hit through enhanced purchasing practices and more effective conservation outreach. Successes within the land and resource conservation measures are due in part to the relationships that rural and resource program staff have built with forest and farm landowners.

Cooperative relationships with cities and investments in new trails allow such a high percentage of residents to have easy access to King County's 175 miles of regional trails.

#### Strategies going forward

DNRP will continue to improve processes and systems to ensure its wastewater plants, transfer stations and landfills, and the stormwater program in unincorporated King County meet or exceed regulatory requirements. DNRP will seek to increase the monitoring of the environmental conditions

#### Goal 1 Environmental Services



#### Related Information

[Brightwater Project](#)  
[Interactive Stormwater Projects Map](#)



that our programs seek to improve, which will help ensure permit compliance.

Over the next few years, DNRP will develop and implement new ways of tracking progress on capital projects, including the use of scorecards for capital project performance, which will include address features such as energy efficiency and other sustainability issues.

With the new King County Flood Control Zone District in place, DNRP will implement its flood hazard management plan to advance both public safety goals and ecological improvements.

DNRP's land and resource conservation efforts will expand to better use all of the tools available, including public acquisition of key parcels and promotion of enhanced stewardship on private lands, plus innovative solutions such as King County's nationally acclaimed transfer of development rights program.

Through the acquisition of the Eastside rail corridor from Renton to Snohomish, DNRP hopes to significantly expand the regional trail network and provide a viable commuting options. Other projects could include establishing connectors to link separate trails into a more complete network.

More information about King County's Facility/Permit Compliance, Land and Resource Conservation, Regional Trail Access, Flood Safety, and Capital Investment is available by continuing to the pages for these performance measures:

- [Facility/Permit Compliance](#)
- [Land and Resource Conservation](#)
- [Regional Trail Access](#)
- [Flood Safety](#)
- [Capital Investment](#)

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

**Updated: December 18, 2008**

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Environmental Services](#) » Regional Trail Access



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                                |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                            |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption           | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships    | Price of Service |
| Regional Trail Access    |                  | Flood Safety    | Land and Resource Conservation |            |                        | Capital Investment    | Facility/permit compliance |                  |


### REGIONAL TRAIL ACCESS

2007 Rating:

#### Residents' proximity to regional trails

**About this Measure:** The King County has one of the best trail systems in the nation with over 294 miles of trails for hiking, biking, walking, and horseback riding. King County Parks has developed and is involved in the operations of the majority of these facilities — approximately 171 miles. The overall trail network reaches many parts of the region, from Bothell to Auburn and Seattle to North Bend and beyond. Parks and trails consistently rate as one of the most important amenities for home buyers and, for many, these trails provide an active transportation alternative to personal motor vehicle use. Proximity to the Regional Trail System reflects residents' ability to access and use this wonderful resource.

Regional Trail Access



- Meets or exceeds target
- Approaches target
- Needs improvement
- Insufficient data at this time

**2007 results:** By the end of 2007, 68.5 percent of King County residents (about 1.2 million people) lived within 1.5 miles of the Regional Trail System.

**2007 target:** 69% of county residents living within 1.5 miles of the Regional Trail system

**2008 target:** 70% of county residents living within 1.5 miles of the Regional Trail system

**What influences this measure?** Residents' proximity to the Regional Trail System improves when King County and local cities expand the trail system through the use of parklands and the purchase and conversion of railroad rights-of-way and utility corridors. Expansion of the system requires formidable effort, however, due to challenges in obtaining appropriate right-of-way, environmental constraints, budget limitations, and diversity in local approaches to system development. King County Parks is taking a leadership role in the development and coordination of the overall system.

Results for this measure improve most significantly when new trails miles are developed closer to densely populated neighborhoods, where utilization rates will be higher. Many of these areas are located in local cities where the county may help plan and coordinate development. Construction of new trails is often the responsibility of the local jurisdiction, however.

Much of the more easily available and less expensive rights-of-way have been acquired and integrated into the Regional Trail System. Often the missing links in the system require expensive elements such as bridges over roads or waterways, or navigation around sensitive areas such as wetlands. Additionally, in urban areas, existing build-out presents substantial challenges to creating new trail corridors do to the lack of readily available land.

**Strategies moving forward:** In the years to come, King County Parks will continue to plan, acquire, develop, and maintain the trail network that will expand King County's share of the system to 300 miles. In addition, the county is actively pursuing development of a regional trail network and planning to include the Eastside BNSF rail corridor as an important component. The county continues to collaborate with cities on regional trail development. New trail developments typically are prioritized using criteria that include connectivity, aesthetic/scenic value, timing/relationship with other projects,

#### Related Information

[Regional Trail Access equity information](#)

[King County Regional Trails](#)


[King County Bike Map](#)

[Walking Maps in King County](#)

[Burlington Northern Rail Line acquisition](#)

[Interactive Parks Map](#)

public support, and urban/rural centers connections.



## Proximity of residents to the regional trail network

2006 Findings

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

## Technical Notes

[+](#) For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County

Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)


☐ Search this section

 You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Environmental Services](#) » Flood Safety


print

## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                                |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                            |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption           | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships    | Price of Service |
| Regional Trail Access    |                  | Flood Safety    | Land and Resource Conservation |            |                        | Capital Investment    | Facility/permit compliance |                  |

### FLOOD SAFETY

2007 Rating:

**About this measure:** This measure describes the flood hazard risks reduced through the King County flood protection program. King County's flood protection program went through a significant transition in 2007, and this one-time measure describes the degree the program was authorized and funded. Future measures will assess changes in flood risk exposure and vulnerability that result from implementation of the County's flood protection program.

**2007 results:** During 2007 King County took several significant steps to identify and respond to the flood hazards facing our communities. First, in January 2007, the King County Council adopted the 2006 Flood Hazard Management Plan, updating the 1993 Flood Hazard Reduction Plan. This Plan includes an evaluation of flood hazard vulnerabilities and an action plan of capital projects and programmatic activities intended to reduce flood risks throughout the County.

Following adoption of the Plan, the Council then authorized the formation of the King County Flood Control Zone District (KCFCZD) under RCW 86.15, including the voluntary establishment of an Advisory Committee of 15 elected officials to provide the KCFCZD Board of Supervisors with expert policy advice on the District's work program priorities and budget. The Advisory Committee is supported by King County staff with input and recommendations from Basin Technical Committees comprised of public works and planning officials from cities throughout the County.


Based on input from the Basin Technical Committees and King County staff over the spring and summer of 2007, the Advisory Committee submitted a recommended work program and budget to the Board of Supervisors in August, including a recommended funding level for 2008. In November 2007 the Board adopted these recommendations and authorized funding of approximately \$33 million in 2008 for capital and operating programs targeted at repairing flood damage from the November 2006 floods and initiating levee rehabilitations on each major river system in the County.

**2007 target:** During 2007 the target for the flood risk reduction program were as follows:

- Adoption of a comprehensive flood risk reduction plan to guide the County's flood risk reduction efforts
- Creation of a countywide Flood Control Zone District to provide consistent, efficient, and strategic flood protection services throughout the County.
- Adoption of a work program and budget sufficient to implement the recommendations of the 2006 Flood Plan.

**Influencing Factors:** King County's ability to implement the meet 2007 targets was influenced by the participation, involvement and support of cities through the Basin Technical Committees and the Advisory Committee, as well as actions by the KCFCZD Board of Supervisors.

**Strategy Going Forward:** Activities during 2007 established the planning, funding, and decision-making foundations for King County's flood protection efforts. During 2008 we will be evaluating methods for assessing the flood hazard reduction impacts of the District's capital and operating




#### Related Information

[How to prepare for a flood](#)
[Flood Buyout and Home Elevation Program](#)
[King County Flooding Topics](#)
[Interactive Hazard Areas Map](#)
[Master Recycler Composter](#)

programs. There are several possible approaches, ranging from the relatively coarse Hazard Vulnerability Analysis contained in the 2006 Flood Plan to the data-intensive HAZards United States (HAZUS) software package developed by FEMA. The successful approach must include basic risk assessment capabilities, such as:

1. Identification of flood, erosion, and channel migration hazards,
2. Assessment of the potential impacts of the hazard based on past flood conditions, current flow data and land use, and tailored to each major river system and individual river reaches,
3. Analysis of the hazard exposure or vulnerability for a selected area including impacts to life, safety and health, structures, natural and environmental areas, future development and economic areas.
4. Estimate the impacts of both capital and programmatic actions implemented by the King County Flood Control Zone District.




**Water and land resources division capital improvement project locations**

2005 - 2007

*Click on each river name to download a detailed PDF map.*

## Technical Notes

 For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

**SEARCH**  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Environmental Services](#) » Land and Resource Conservation



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS  |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES                            |                       |                         |                  |
|---|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment   | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services                          | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Regional Trail Access   Flood Safety   Land and Resource Conservation |                  |                 |                      |            | Capital Investment   Facility/permit compliance |                       |                         |                  |

### LAND AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION

2007 Rating:

#### Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD)


##### Conservation of Natural Lands

**About this measure:** This measure indexes three sub-measures yielding information about the effectiveness of land acquisition, stewardship and incentive programs administered by the Water and Land Resources Division.

##### This measure combines:

- The percentage of privately owned rural acres with a stewardship plan or that is enrolled in an open space incentive program. This includes farm, forest or rural stewardship plans, or enrollment in the Public Benefit Rating System for timber land, forest and agriculture.
- The percentage of public and private rural acres in permanent conservation. This includes those with conservation easements or land that is owned by a public agency.
- The percentage of total acres acquired by King County in 2007, through both fee simple agreements and easements (excluding those received by Transfer of Development Credits Program) that are medium-high or high priority lands.

#### Land and Resource Conservation



- Meets or exceeds target
- Approaches target
- Needs improvement
- Insufficient data at this time

For all of these measures, rural acres refer to all rural and agriculture zoned land, including Vashon Island and excluding the Forest Production District.

**2007 results:** Rural acres with stewardship plan or enrolled in open space incentive program:

- 2007 Results:** 29.82 percent
- 2007 target:** 29 percent

##### Rural acres in permanent conservation

- 2007 Results:** 21.99 percent
- 2007 target:** 22 percent

##### High to medium-high priority lands acquired

- 2007 Results:** 90.7 percent
- 2007 target:** = 80 percent

##### (New) Annual targets 2008 and beyond:

Because the incremental change of the first two land conservation measures is so small, targets are being converted from percentages of total rural acreage to actual acreage enrolled or conserved. The third acquisition measure will retain its target of 80 percent per year. Here are the new targets:

- Rural acres with stewardship plan or enrolled in open space incentive program: 2500 acres per

#### Related Information

[Natural Resource Lands](#)  
[Greenprint](#)  
[Water and Land Resources Division](#)  
[King County Parks & Recreation](#)  
[Interactive Parks Map](#)  
[Land Management](#)




year

- Rural acres in permanent conservation: 500 acres per year
- High to medium-high priority lands acquired per year: 80 percent

**Influencing factors:** Budget allocations, regulatory and policy changes all play a role in land conservation and acquisition activities. Implementing policy plans, such as salmon restoration plans or the flood hazard reduction plan, often identify or call for specific land acquisition and protection and outreach and education toward improving stewardship and changing environmental behavior.


**Strategy going forward:** Continue effective program delivery in encouraging stewardship and conservation on privately owned lands, and making the case for directing funds toward lands identified as high priority.

Next year, a new measure to reflect the performance of the Transfer of Development Credits Program will be developed. That program's focus may be expanded if changes proposed in the Executive's 2008 Comprehensive Plan are adopted by the King County Council later this year.




#### Rural acres in land management program

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)



#### Rural acres in conservation status

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)



#### Priority Greenprint acres acquired

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County

- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.



**Updated: December 18, 2008**

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
■ Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Environmental Services](#) » Capital Investment



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                                |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                            |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption           | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships    | Price of Service |
| Regional Trail Access    |                  | Flood Safety    | Land and Resource Conservation |            |                        | Capital Investment    | Facility/permit compliance |                  |


### CAPITAL INVESTMENT

2007 Rating:

**About this measure:** DNRP invests significant financial resources into system improvements of the natural and built environment. The Wastewater Treatment Division is focusing capital investments on increasing reliability and expanding capacity of the wastewater conveyance and treatment system. The Parks Division has been primarily steering capital investments toward improvements in the regional trail network. Solid Waste Division capital projects have been targeting transfer stations improvement, while the Water and Land Resource Division has been investing in habitat enhancements and protecting homes and businesses from flooding.

In 2007 all King County departments were given direction for tracking the rate for achieving capital project milestones. Summary information about capital projects is provided below, as well as maps showing the locations of capital investments over recent years.

Capital Investment Schedules



#### Related Information

[Brightwater Project](#)  
[Interactive Stormwater Projects Map](#)  
[Business Plan](#)

### Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD)

#### Capital investment summary

**About this measure:** WTD tracks accomplishment of scheduled major milestones for capital projects. In response to a county wide effort by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to track achievement of scheduled milestones for applicable CIP projects, WTD also reports this information to OMB on a quarterly basis. The milestones are the planned completion dates for planning, predesign, final design, implementation and close out of all capital projects.

**2007 results:** 57% of projects met their planned completion dates for major milestones in 2007.


**2007 target:** 75% of projects will meet the planned completion dates for major milestones

**2008 target:** 75% of projects will meet the planned completion dates for major milestones

**Influencing factors:** Scheduled project milestones entered into WTD's common project management database, Filemaker Pro, have been inconsistently maintained and updated by all project managers in the past. There have also been inconsistencies in the way individual project managers schedule milestone accomplishment dates. Therefore actual accomplishment dates for scheduled milestones have often not met the scheduled completion dates. New quarterly reporting requirements now prompt project managers to regularly check and update milestone schedules and log any reasons for schedule delays.

**Strategy going forward:** WTD is currently implementing a standardized project management approach based on Project Management International (PMI) standards. Increased accuracy in project scheduling is one of the key areas of focus in implementing these new project management standards. WTD project managers have taken training in PMI project management practices and will

begin implementing these practices on their projects. This should result in higher accuracy in scheduling, and a higher accomplishment rate in meeting scheduled project milestones.



#### Wastewater Treatment Division Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Locations

2005 - 2007

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

## Parks Division

### Capital Investment Summary

**About this measure:** Parks capital investments in 2007 included rehabilitating aging bridge and trestle structures to ensure continued reliability, acquisition of new right-of-way to serve as future regional trail corridors, expanding existing trails to connect missing links to serve a greater number of users in the urban and rural areas.


This measure tracks the degree that capital projects meet design and construction milestones

**2007 results:** 62.5 % of scheduling milestones met

**2007 target:** 75% of scheduling milestones met

**Influencing factors:** Challenges associated with property acquisition and permitting slowed the completion of several projects and had a significant effect on hitting project development milestones

**Strategy going forward:** The Parks Division, and Facilities Management Division staff who develop capital projects for the Parks Division, will continue to seek efficiencies in the design and construction process to improve the degree of capital development milestones met.



#### Parks Division Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Locations

2004 - 2007

[Click to download the PDF version.](#)

## Solid Waste Division (SWD)

### Percent of milestones achieved for Solid Waste Division capital projects

**About this performance measure:** This performance measure provides a snapshot of Capital Improvement Program (CIP) accomplishments. This is achieved by comparing actual expenditures for CIP projects reported in the King County Accounting Resources Management System (ARMS) with the projections for expenditures made at the beginning of the year. The target for this measure is for actual expenditures to be at least 75% of forecasted expenditures.

**2007 Results:** 98%


**2007 Target:** 75%

**2008 Target:** 75%

**Influencing Factors:** The main factor influencing the Construction fund in 2007 was the reconstruction of the Shoreline Transfer Station (formerly First Northeast). Performance for the Landfill Reserve Fund in 2007 was driven by the final closure of Area 5 at the Cedar Hills Landfill.

**Strategy Going Forward:** In 2008, the division will continue to modernize the solid waste transfer system in preparation for the eventual closure of the Cedar Hills Landfill and transition to waste export. In 2008, site development will begin for the re-construction of the Bow Lake Transfer Station. Planning will restart for re-construction of the Factoria Transfer Station and is also expected to start for new transfer stations proposed for both north and south King County. In addition, an evaluation will begin for alternatives to extend the life of the Cedar Hills Landfill to complete planning for waste export.

**Technical Notes:** As of December 31, 2007 the overall CIP program had exceeded its performance target for this measure with expenditures at 98% of forecasted expenditures. The Construction Fund forecast was \$27.2M and expenditures through December were \$28.0M, or 103% of target. The Landfill Reserve Fund forecast was \$7.0M and actual expenditures were \$5.6M, or 80% of target. The 98% program performance figure is the weighted average of the forecasted performance for both funds.



#### Solid Waste Division Capital Improvement Project Locations

*Click to download the PDF version.*

## Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD)

### Capital Investment Summary Restoring and Protecting Waterways

Every year, between 25 and 30 percent of King County generated surface water management fees are transferred to its capital budget for large and small projects to improve storm drainage and create or improve streams and wetlands. These projects aim to restore aquatic habitat and to protect public health and safety. Capital funds are also used to leverage grants from other sources and pay debt service on older, bond financed surface and stormwater improvement projects.

In 2007, eleven large habitat restoration and stormwater improvement projects, dozens of smaller projects, and four drainage emergency responses were completed. The Des Moines Creek high-flow bypass was constructed, completing this multi-year, multi-million dollar suite of regional projects that provide regional stormwater detention, improve stream habitat, restore fish passage, and reduce damaging flows from the creek. Water and Land Capital staff did the design work and construction oversight for a consortium including WSDOT, the Port of Seattle, and the Cities of SeaTac and Des Moines. East of Woodinville, the Cold Creek Natural Area Wetland Improvement project was constructed on County-owned land near Cottage Lake. Project costs totaling nearly \$700,000 were contributed by the Williams Pipeline Company as mitigation for major natural gas pipeline improvements constructed in northern King County. This project was the first to be completed under the new Mitigation Reserve program created in conjunction with the Critical Areas Ordinance.

**About this measure:** Water and Land's Capital Projects Section does work for many different clients both within and outside of King County government. In 2006, the section developed a milestone measure to track its efficacy in planning for and meeting capital project goals. All projects include up to eight significant phases or milestones. This measure tracks completed project milestones compared those planned. Meeting and exceeding established planning targets suggests that this group is able to anticipate, compensate and/or overcome potential delays.

This is an important measure for section management to track since delays in project concept, design and construction can arise from the client, permitting agencies or other unforeseen variables. Ultimately this measure speaks to the efficacy of this group in successfully planning, managing, and completing projects.

**2006 results:** met ~70% of all planned milestones



**2006 target:** meet 70% of all planned milestones


**2007 results:** met 93% of all planned milestones (exceeded target by 137%)

**2007 target:** meet 70% of all planned milestones

**2008 target:** meet 75% of all planned milestones

**Influencing factors:** Uncertainty of project concept or design, changes in project scope, issues raised by the public and funding can all delay the implementation of a capital habitat restoration or public health and safety project.

**Strategy going forward:** Section management will continue to track staff response toward meeting planned milestones. When performance falls short of planned milestone targets, an investigation of the cause and possible solution to the hurdle will be pursued.



#### Water and land resources division capital improvement project locations

2005 - 2007

*Click to download the PDF version.*

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.  
[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)





King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Environmental Services](#) » Facility/permit compliance



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                                |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                       |                            |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption           | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships    | Price of Service |
| Regional Trail Access    |                  | Flood Safety    | Land and Resource Conservation |            |                        | Capital Investment    | Facility/permit compliance |                  |


### FACILITY/PERMIT COMPLIANCE

2007 Rating:

**About this measure:** This is one of DNRP's highest priority measures, as it shows how facilities and operations are performing across an array of regulated activities. Performance requirements for transfer stations, landfills, storm and wastewater facilities are detailed, complex and critically important toward protecting the health of our environment and our public health and safety.

DNRP tracks and reports on the degree regulatory requirements are met or exceeded through a variety of mechanisms, including treatment plant effluents sampling, air emissions monitoring, and on-site inspections and audits. To serve various programs, DNRP has environmental research scientists on staff and maintains an award winning water quality laboratory for analytical support.

Permit and Facility Compliance



#### Related Information

##### Wastewater

Wastewater facility distribution equity information

Wastewater Treatment Division

South Wastewater Treatment Plant Permit

West Point Wastewater Treatment Plant (Modification) Permit

##### Solid Waste

Solid Waste Division

##### Stormwater

Drainage complaints equity information

Stormwater Topics

Interactive Stormwater Projects Map

Ecology's link to 2007 Municipal Stormwater NPDES Permit

### Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD)

#### WTD Air Quality Permit Compliance

**About this measure:** This measure looks at the percentage of compliance with air quality limits and conditions as regulated via Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) permits and orders of approvals (OA's) on WTD's regional wastewater plants and offsite stations.

**2007 Results:** 98.13%

**2007 Target:** 100%

**2008 Target:** 100%

**Influencing Factors:** Establishing achievable conditions/limits via PSCAA permit process, quality of design and installation of chemical systems and control equipment, on-going condition of control equipment, balancing maintenance response based on level of redundancy and inventory parts, providing appropriate O&M training, clear and full understanding of all limits and operating conditions, and staying abreast of changing regulations.

**Strategy going forward:** WTD created an air quality compliance team to oversee and facilitate compliance issues at all WTD facilities. The AQ-compliance team already plays an active role in responding to draft permit conditions for the Brightwater Treatment Plant's air quality control equipment. An Air Quality Environmental Management System (AQ-EMS) is being developed for South Plant to enhance the implementation of compliance, odor control, and best practices initiatives, including identifying training and safety issues. O&M staff with experience of chemical systems and air-quality control equipment had notable input during Brightwater design. WTD will continue to evaluate modifications of equipment and operating changes to improve air quality and improve reliability of equipment operation.

## WTD NPDES Permit Reporting Compliance

**About this measure:** This measure describes the percentage of compliance with analytical/reporting requirements as defined by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit limits for county-owned and operated wastewater treatment plants.

**2007 Results:** 99.30%

**2007 Target:** 100%

**2008 Target:** 100%

**Influencing Factors:** Analytical and reporting requirements are set by the Washington State Department of Ecology in NPDES permits and state permits. Success in current lab/reporting performance may allow Ecology to ease future reporting requirements. EPA Audit results expected to be reported in summer of 2008 may affect the number and frequency of tests required. South Plant Lab moved to temporary facilities from Fall-07 to Spring-09 for construction of a new administration building.

**Strategy going forward:** Complete required lab analyses and reports on time and following standard procedures. The county will work with the Department of Ecology via permit negotiations to ease analytical requirements based on past performance. The County is currently in negotiations for renewal of the permits for both regional wastewater treatment plants in 2009.

## WTD Effluent Limit Compliance (NPDES Permits)


**About this measure:** This measure addresses the percentage of compliance with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit limits for the county's major regional wastewater treatment plants.

**2007 Results:** 100 percent. Both West Point and South treatment plants continue to consistently achieve 100% compliance with their NPDES permits. Both plants are anticipated to receive Platinum Peak Performance Awards from the National Association of Clean Water Agencies (NACWA) for the second year in a row.

**2007 Target:** 100 percent

**Influencing factors:** The Washington State Department of Ecology issued new NPDES permits to both plants in 2004. South Plant's limits remained the same while West Point's limits included more stringent requirements and some technical reporting changes.

**Strategy going forward:** All WTD sections contribute strategies to ensure success in NPDES compliance, such as: performing preventive maintenance, providing employees with training and tools, developing asset management plans for major equipment maintenance, and many other coordinated NPDES compliance efforts across the division.



## Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD)

### Surface water management permit compliance (NPDES stormwater)


**2007 results:** 100 percent compliance

**2007 target:** 100 percent compliance

**2008 target:** 100 percent target

**About this measure:** The Washington State Department of Ecology is responsible for administering the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit to ensure compliance with the federal Clean Water Act. Permit. The permit strives to address the negative impacts of surface or stormwater flows on natural resources by requiring facility maintenance, retrofit, public education and outreach and scientific sampling and analysis of the water quality of surface waters. This measure gauges compliance with eleven categories in the permit.

**Percent compliance with stormwater with no notices of violations**



**Influencing factors:** The more developed an area becomes the faster rain or surface waters flow into creeks, streams and rivers. These surface waters carry pollutants that eventually enter water bodies like large lakes and the Puget Sound. Both increased flows and dirty water can cause damage to natural habitats, affect water temperature and its chemical composition which can negatively affect fish and wildlife populations.

**Strategy going forward:** New requirements called for in the 2007 permit are more stringent and compliance with many components is being held to specific timelines. This year, King County, along with 35 jurisdictions, are administering a comprehensive public outreach and education campaign. The media, web and grassroots effort will speak to how everyday actions affect the water quality of our surface and storm waters.

11 Categories of Requirements for Compliance with NPDES Permit for Municipal Surface Water Discharges

1. Legal Authority
2. MS4 / Mapping / Documentation (Outflow and location of large, mostly commercial pipes carrying stormwater)
3. Coordination
4. Public Involvement and Participation
5. Controlling Runoff from New Development, Redevelopment and Construction Site
6. Structural Stormwater Controls
7. Source Control Program for Existing Development
8. Illicit Connections/Discharges Detection and Elimination
9. Operation and Maintenance Program
10. Education and Outreach Program
11. Monitoring

## Solid Waste Division (SWD)

Percent of Solid Waste facility inspections that meet or exceed regulatory requirements: health, stormwater and air quality.

**2007 Results:** 95.67%

**2007 Weighted Target:** 96.66%

**2008 Target:** 100%

**Percent of Health Department inspection reports that do not result in a notice of violation for solid waste facilities.**

**2007 Results:** 100%.

**2007 Target:** 100%.

**2008 Target:** 100%.

**Influencing Factors:** Good results were achieved through efficient operation and maintenance of facilities.

**Strategy Going Forward:** Efficient operation and maintenance will continue in 2008.

### Percent of storm water inspections that meet National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) criteria.


**2007 Results:** 87%.

**2007 Target:** 90%.

**2008 Target:** 100%

**Influencing Factors:** In 2007, all required inspections were completed. Some problems continued at the closed Houghton Transfer Station regarding ballfield construction but were resolved in the first half of the year. Other problems were noted in inspections at the Cedar Hills Landfill immediately following a winter storm; however the necessary repairs were already in the process of being implemented.

**Strategy Going Forward:** In 2008, regulatory requirements are anticipated to change, increasing inspections at the Cedar Hills Landfill and reducing inspections at closed landfills. Staff will continue to prioritize the workload to complete required inspections.



### Percent of air samples taken demonstrating that no landfill gas is released at Cedar Hills through the landfill surface.

**2007 Results:** 100%


**2007 Target:** 100%.

**2008 Target:** 100%.

**Influencing Factors:** Good results were achieved through efficient operation of the landfill gas system and maintenance of the landfill cover system.

**Strategy Going Forward:** Efficient operation and maintenance will continue in 2008. In addition to the five new vertical gas wells installed in 2007, more vertical wells might be installed in 2008 to collect additional landfill gas which would further lower the gas pressure and reduce the chance of leaks.

## Technical Notes

 For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County





King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » Sustainable Resources



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS                                       |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES                           |                       |                         |                  |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment  | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services                         | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Green Building   Energy Plan   Wastewater Resource Reclamation |                  |                 |                      |            | Climate Protection   Solid/Hazardous Waste Mgt |                       |                         |                  |

### SUSTAINABLE RESOURCES

2007 Rating:

This roll-up measure summarizes the degree DNRP is achieving its **Sustainable Resources goal**:

*Create resources from waste, reduce emissions and increase the efficiency of facilities and operations.*

#### 2007 results

DNRP's rating for the performance measures that support this goal is a yellow — signifying results are within 10 percent of target.

Areas under this goal where DNRP performance exceeds target:

- Wastewater Resource Reclamation

Areas under this goal where DNRP performance approaches target:

- Solid and Hazardous Waste Management
- Climate Protection
- Green Building

Areas under this goal where DNRP performance needs improvement:

- Energy Plan Implementation

#### Key influencing factors


For many years, DNRP divisions and programs have been aggressively researching, analyzing and adopting appropriate technologies for harvesting resources from wastewater and solid waste streams. In 2007, the Wastewater Treatment Division was able to meet its targets for reclaiming both water and biosolids from the wastewater treatment system.

Reducing solid waste disposal and improving recycling rates require individual and institutional behavior changes, while the industrial pre-treatment program helps businesses reduce pollutants that, left untreated, would enter the wastewater treatment stream.

Energy Plan implementation has been hampered by aging equipment for converting biogas collected from the wastewater treatment process, and system development challenges have slowed the implementation of technology to convert landfill methane into a usable energy.

#### Strategies going forward

The completion of the Brightwater Treatment Plant in 2010 will significantly increase available volumes of reclaimed water. New regulations, incentive programs and outreach efforts are helping



#### Related Information

[What do I do With...?](#)

[Solid Waste Recycling](#)

[Garage & Yard Sales](#)

[Household Online Materials Exchange](#)

[Industrial Materials Exchange](#)

[Solid Waste Business Services](#)

[Hazardous Waste Disposal](#)

[Water Supply in King County](#)

[WTD Reclaimed Water Program](#)

[Biosolids](#)

ensure that the wastewater treatment program can increase its production of resources from wastewater.

A contractor is now installing technologies for converting landfill gas into a usable energy source.

Upcoming efforts to improve recycling rates and reduce the amount of solid waste that comes to King County's Cedar Hills Regional Landfill include policy changes, outreach and education and improvements in solid waste management facilities that will be outlined in the 2008-09 update to the King County Solid Waste Comprehensive Management Plan.

DNRP is now completing its resource management database to help improve the tracking and analysis of resource consumption at its facilities. This application will highlight opportunities to improve efficiencies. The Green Building team is adding resources to the GreenTools Web site to better support project managers and developers who seek to achieve LEED certification or add sustainable features to infrastructure projects.

Teams are in place to ensure coordinated implementation of King County's inter-related Climate Protection and Energy plans. An assessment of operational greenhouse gas emissions required for King County's participation in the Chicago Climate Exchange is helping staff identify opportunities for reducing energy use and greenhouse gas emissions.

More information about King County's Solid/Hazardous Waste Mgt, Wastewater Resource Reclamation, Facility Conservation, Energy Plan, and Climate Protection is available by continuing to the pages for these performance measures:

- [Solid/Hazardous Waste Mgt](#)
- [Climate Protection](#)
- [Wastewater Resource Reclamation](#)
- [Energy Plan](#)
- [Green Building](#)

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

**Updated: December 18, 2008**

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County

Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
☐ Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Sustainable Resources](#) » Green Building



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE


| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS                                       |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES                           |                       |                         |                  |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment  | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services                         | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Green Building   Energy Plan   Wastewater Resource Reclamation |                  |                 |                      |            | Climate Protection   Solid/Hazardous Waste Mgt |                       |                         |                  |

### GREEN BUILDING

2007 Rating:

Percent of new, eligible, construction, renovation and remodeling projects within King County government that have achieved any level of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating.

**About This Performance Measure:** This measure represents the number of commercial buildings being built by King County government that meet certain environmental standards. The standard being used is the national Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating system. The U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) developed the LEED rating system to provide a benchmark for the design, construction and operation of high performance commercial green buildings. LEED recognizes performance in five key areas of human and environmental health: sustainable site development, water savings, energy efficiency, materials selection and indoor environmental quality.



**2007 Results:** 1

**2007 Target:** 4

**2008 Target:** 5

**Influencing Factors:** Some County buildings that could qualify for LEED certification have not gone through the certification process. The King County Green Building ordinance states that buildings must get certified if it is within budget to do so. As material and labor costs have increased, LEED certification has not been pursued for every eligible project. In addition, it takes several years for a project to go from registration to completion to certification, thus projects registered in one year will be certified several years later.

**Strategy Going Forward:** In 2008, an updated green building and sustainable development ordinance is expected to be adopted by the Metropolitan King County Council. The ordinance requires county owned and financed building projects that are eligible to attain a LEED Gold rating. SWD will continue to provide LEED information and training to King County project managers in 2008, including hosting a conference for project managers as well as ongoing trainings.

#### Related Information

[Sustainable Building Topics](#)

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.



Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Sustainable Resources](#) » Energy Plan



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS                                       |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES                           |                       |                         |                  |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment  | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services                         | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Green Building   Energy Plan   Wastewater Resource Reclamation |                  |                 |                      |            | Climate Protection   Solid/Hazardous Waste Mgt |                       |                         |                  |

### ENERGY PLAN

2007 Rating:  

#### Energy Plan Implementation

##### Progress toward Implementation of King County Energy Plan

**About this performance measure:** King County Executive Ron Sims issued an Executive Order in 2006 establishing renewable energy use goals for King County government operations and directed the development of a plan to meet these goals.


The renewable energy order requires that, compared to 2007 baseline levels:

- 50% of King County's facility and operations energy come from renewable sources by 2012 (except for the Metro Bus Fleet)
- 35% of energy for Metro buses come from efficiencies and renewables by 2015
- 50% of energy for Metro buses come from efficiencies and renewables by 2020

King County has mapped a comprehensive strategy for achieving the Executive Order goals through its Energy Plan, major elements of which include:

- Staffing an Energy Task Force representing all major energy-using departments and divisions in the county to implement the Plan.
- Broad adoption of utility accounting software to benchmark facilities and track progress towards energy goals; reporting results to Executive
- Energy policy definition and implementation to improve energy efficiency, conserve energy aggressively, and expand use of renewable energy sources as described in the sections below.

Energy Plan Implementation



#### Related Information

[Global Warming Action Plan](#)  
[Executive's Global Warming site](#)  
[King County Climate Change Conference results](#)

### Renewable Energy And Energy Capture

**Supply 50% of King County's non-transit (Metro Transit Bus) energy from renewable sources by 2012, and 35% of King County's transit energy from efficiencies and renewables by 2015. Maximize the conversion of waste-to-energy at county facilities.**

**About this performance measure:** In Executive Order PUT 7-6 directed the county to ultimately supply half (50 percent) of its energy requirements from renewable sources. All the county divisions except DOT/Transit are required to meet this goal by 2012, while Transit is allowed 8 years more (until 2020) to reach the same goal, with option to meet this requirement by equivalently reducing supply requirements through efficiency increases in their operations. The county does not specify preferred sources for these renewable energy supplies.

At the same time, King County provides disposal services for many residents' waste products, both solid and liquid. Processing these waste streams uses significant energy, but can also extract energy

from some of them if properly designed. Currently, the county produces 317,350 million British Thermal Units (MMBtu) per year of renewable energy from its own waste-to-energy operations. This represents almost 60% of renewable energy sources currently in use in the county. While setting very high goals for the portion of energy supply that comes from renewables, the county has expectations that it will be able to meet much or all of its renewables commitments using county-controlled renewable resources.

### 2007 Results:


- 15% Renewable energy supply to county operations (11% in Transit, 19% in all other operations)
- Substantial existing county renewable resources used -- Large biodiesel purchases (228,399 MMBtu) may not be sustainable in future because of costs
- Selection of best development alternatives for large waste-to-energy projects in Solid Waste and Wastewater

**2008 Targets:** Increased renewable energy supply to county operations (nominally to 14% in Transit, 25% in all other operations)

**2009 Targets:** Further increases in renewable energy supply (nominally to 17% in Transit, 31% in all other operations) Solid Waste division landfill gas project expected to come on line selling "renewable" gas

**Influencing factors:** A primary factor in achieving renewable target is the speed and degree that county renewable resources are developed (from Wastewater and Solid Waste divisions). Another factor is the future price of renewable energy technologies and developments and the price of "Renewable Energy Certificates," (RECs) on local energy markets.

**Strategy going forward:** With the development of a large landfill gas scrubbing operation at Cedar Hills landfill in 2009, the amount of "renewable" energy resource the county controls and can claim as available to meet its goals (either as greenhouse gas credits or some form of renewable energy certificate) should dramatically expand while the gas (which is typically classed as a "renewable resource") is extracted from the landfill. While challenged to meet its renewable energy goals in the short term (next 2-3 years), the county should have enough renewable energy from the landfill to exceed its goals set in the Executive Order for approximately 20 years after 2010. This assumes the Solid Waste division is able and willing to certify and share its Cedar Hills landfill gas greenhouse gas reduction credits or equivalent RECs with the entire county to meet the county's renewable energy goals. If this is not allowed or impractical meeting the renewables goals may be quite expensive. What the long term strategy for renewables may be beyond the 20 year life of the landfill is unclear at this time.



## (E.2) Achieve a 10 percent normalized net reduction in County energy use by 2012.

**About this performance measure:** Efficiency and other types of energy savings strategies are widely recognized to be the appropriate first line of attack to reduce the impacts (cost and environmental) of energy uses, because saving energy is usually cheaper than supplying energy. The Energy Plan sets an easily measurable and attainable performance goal to reduce energy use 10 percent in county departments over the next 5 years against 2007 levels. The interim targets presented below assume constant progress to the 5-year goal; however, energy savings acquisitions are typically less regular, so year-to-year use reductions may be different.

### 2007 Results:

- 2007 established as baseline year
- County efficiency / conservation project history assembled
- Energy Task Force agreed on efficiency goals

### 2008 Targets:

- 2% energy use reduction in County operations from 2007
- Staff training and education on energy efficiency
- Energy auditing and efficiency / conservation projects


### 2009 Targets:

- 4% energy use reduction in County operations from 2007
- Continued auditing and implementation of energy saving projects

**Influencing factors:** Leadership and operational level commitments to energy saving, staff training on methods to save and track savings, and directives to incorporate these activities in their work; financial support for programs and projects that will result in savings; tracking, reporting and rewarding success in energy savings efforts.

### Strategy going forward:

- Educate / train staff on energy saving strategies
- Conduct and/or update resource efficiency audits in all county facilities, and develop energy savings action plans for each facility audited
- Develop detailed energy management plans for energy intensive special-purpose facilities such as prisons
- Secure commitments to streamlined funding approaches and for specific projects.
- Pursue utility grant funding and other funding





## Technical Notes

⊕ For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Sustainable Resources](#) » Wastewater Resource Reclamation



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS                                       |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES                           |                       |                         |                  |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment  | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services                         | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Green Building   Energy Plan   Wastewater Resource Reclamation |                  |                 |                      |            | Climate Protection   Solid/Hazardous Waste Mgt |                       |                         |                  |

### WASTEWATER RESOURCE RECLAMATION

2007 Rating:

#### Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD)

##### Reclaimed water volumes met

**About this performance measure:** This measure tracks the amount of wastewater that DNRP converts into a resource — reclaimed water.

**2007 Results:** 292.5 Million Gallons (MG)/year


**2007 Target:** 260 MG/yr

**2008 Target:** 300 MG/yr

**Influencing factors:** Both WTD treatment plants continue to reclaim all water needed for their own operations and any needed by customers. South Plant continued to use reclaimed water for nearly all their compatible internal process needs and irrigation demand. This accounted for about 95% of all reclaimed water used in 2007. The offsite acreage irrigated with reclaimed water in 2007 and 2006 was nearly the same.

**Strategy going forward:** DNRP's success in converting wastewater into a resource will depend on the cost of providing treatment and conveyance for reclaimed water relative to the cost of using existing sources and/or providing new sources of surface and groundwater. DNRP will be developing a regional water supply plan that will address the role of reclaimed water in meeting the region's diverse water supply needs. There are plans to irrigate Foster's Links (18-hole gold course in Tukwila) with reclaimed water starting in summer 2008. This will increase offsite reclaimed water use from South Plant substantially.

Wastewater Resource Reclamation



- Meets or exceeds target
- Approaches target
- Needs improvement
- Insufficient data at this time

#### Related Information

[WTD facilities equity information](#)

[Water Supply in King County](#)

[WTD Reclaimed Water Program](#)

[Biosolids](#)

##### Biosolids reuse targets met

**About this performance measure:** This measure represents WTD's ability to produce biosolids, a nutrient-rich organic material produced by treating wastewater solids.

**2007 Results:** 100 percent

**2007 Target:** 100 percent


**2008 Target:** 100 percent

**Influencing factors:** Several projects are under way at the treatment plants to improve biosolids quality and reduce digester problems that will help us maintain a target of 100 percent reuse of biosolids. Although 100 percent of available biosolids were reused, the measure requires ongoing attention to ensure this high rate. Truck Haul capacity/availability and access to application sites will have the greatest impact on this measure.

**Strategy going forward:** WTD's strategy for continuing to meet the target of 100 percent biosolids reuse has several components that include:

- Ensuring availability of reuse sites for 150 percent of biosolids production.
- Continuing an aggressive industrial pretreatment program to maintain current low metals levels.
- Maintaining an active research and demonstration program that responds to public concerns and identifies potential new uses for biosolids.
- Investigating Class A technologies and determining which ones would be most appropriate and cost-effective for the West Point and South Plant facilities.

## Technical Notes

 For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

**Updated: December 18, 2008**

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Sustainable Resources](#) » Climate Protection



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS                                       |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES                           |                       |                         |                  |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment  | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services                         | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Green Building   Energy Plan   Wastewater Resource Reclamation |                  |                 |                      |            | Climate Protection   Solid/Hazardous Waste Mgt |                       |                         |                  |

### CLIMATE PROTECTION

2007 Rating:

**About this measure:** The 2007 King County Climate Plan is the initial response to the Executive Orders on Global Warming Preparedness and King County Council Ordinance 12362. The Climate Plan provides an overview of how King County seeks to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and work to anticipate and adapt to climate change impacts.

This performance measure addresses the degree that King County achieves its GHG emissions reduction targets and the degree that progress is being made in the related areas of climate-friendly transportation, clean fuels, clean energy, energy efficiency, land use, building design and infrastructure.

**Drivers:** In 2003, King County Government operations created about 420,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (MTCO<sub>2</sub>e) annually, or about 2% of the King County region's emissions. This is an amount equal to the annual emissions of about 105,000 U.S. vehicles. Production of GHGs (primarily methane) from landfills and wastewater treatment was the dominant source of emissions, with transportation, especially from transit busses, a close second. Finally, electricity usage for operations was the third most important source of emissions, accounting for about 15% of the total.

**Goals:** King County's primary GHG emissions reduction goals are articulated in two ways: by its membership in the Chicago Climate Exchange (CCX), which legally and fiscally commits the county to reducing its direct GHG emissions from gasoline, diesel, heating oil, natural gas, and steam usage to 6% below 2000 levels in 2010, and by its participation and leadership in the Cool Counties Initiative which commits the county to reduce its overall emissions to 80% below 2007 levels by 2050 (see the Cool Counties Executive Order and Cool Counties website).

#### King County Government Operations


**2007 target:** reduction in GHG Emissions to 1.5% below 2000 emissions levels (CCX)

**2008 target:** reduction in GHG Emissions to 3.0 % below 2000 emissions levels (CCX)

**2050:** 80% below 2007 emissions levels (Cool Counties)

#### King County Region (all residents and businesses)

**2050:** 80% below 2007 emissions levels (Cool Counties)




#### Related Information

[Global Warming Action Plan](#)


[Executive's Global Warming site](#)

[King County Climate Change Conference results](#)

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions -  
King County Government Operations  
(including DNRP)**



**Greenhouse Gas Emissions -  
DNRP Operations**




**Status:** A complete inventory of all GHG emissions for King County Operations in 2006 is underway, and when complete, should indicate overall progress when compared to the previously completed 2003 inventory. In the meantime, looking at emissions reported to and audited by the Chicago Climate Exchange, which includes all direct emissions from gasoline, diesel, natural gas, heating oil and steam, should serve as reliable performance measure for much of King County's emissions. For 2000, King County reported 174,265 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e to CCX; for 2007, although data collection is not complete, analysis shows that emissions are very likely to be more than 1.5% below this 2000 baseline. In addition to significant efficiency gains, much of this expected decrease can be attributed to the county's aggressive use of biofuels, especially biodiesel use by the Department of Transportation. (Color equals green)

For the Department of Natural Resources and Parks in 2000 ~30,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e of emissions were reported to CCX. Most of this is attributed to diesel consumption by the Wastewater Treatment and Solid Waste Divisions. Complete data to estimate 2007 emissions is currently being collected. (Color equals grey)


For an analysis of the region's performance status to reach the overall reduction goal of 80% below 2007 levels by 2050, see the Atmosphere section of KingStat's Environmental Indicators. (Color equals yellow)

**Corporate GHG emission -  
King County Government Operations  
(all sources, including DNRP)**



■ 2000 Actual  
 ■ 2007 Actual  
 ◆ 2008 Target  
 ◆ 2009 Target  
 ◇ 2010 Target (6% below 2000 levels)

**Corporate GHG emission -  
DNRP Operations**



■ 2000 Actual  
 ■ 2007 Actual  
 ◆ 2008 Target  
 ◆ 2009 Target  
 ◇ 2010 Target (6% below 2000 levels)

## Existing Response (2007 Update)

### County Operations:

- Completion of the county's operational year 2000 baseline inventory for the Chicago Climate Exchange, in which it was the first county and bus transit agency member
- Addition of greenhouse gas emissions to the environmental review of projects undergoing review mandated by SEPA, including the county's own developments
- Extensive promotion of public transit use, through such programs as InMotion and Partners in Transit and single events such as Earth Day
- Development of tools in the Healthscape program to measure the benefits of non-motorized transportation projects, such as avoided greenhouse gas emissions, walkability and increased public health
- Collaboration with regional, state and federal government entities on such coordinated strategies as greenhouse gas emissions modeling of major transportation projects and tolling
- Active role on Washington State Climate Advisory Team and staff participation in the Transportation Working Group and development of associated recommendations
- Production of the draft 2008 Comprehensive Plan Update, which includes text and policies that support climate change mitigation and adaptation
- Update of the county's Green Building Ordinance and progress on county projects that employed the highest standards of green building
- Enhancements to the Puget Sound Fresh program, such as the addition of the "Eat Local Thanksgiving" initiative, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the freight transportation of non-local food
- Announcement by King County Department of Transportation of a landmark contract with an option to purchase 500 additional hybrid buses, to complement the county's existing hybrid fleet of 213
- Addition of plug-in hybrid-electric vehicles and a cutting-edge heavy-duty hybrid truck into King County's fleet
- Hosting of the "Clean Vehicles Now!" conference, which emphasized the importance of investing in clean vehicle fleets and raised awareness about the clean technologies and fuels available today
- Use of B20 (20 percent blended biofuel) across all appropriate vehicles in the county's fleet
- Establishment by King County Metro Transit of a first-of-its-kind agreement to purchase 2 million gallons of biofuel for use in buses, to be made from canola grown on farms in Yakima County, Washington, which has been fertilized with biosolids from King County's wastewater treatment operations
- Approval of a contract for conversion of methane from the King County Solid Waste Division landfill to usable energy

## Adaptation

- Collaboration with the University of Washington on development of reasonable assumptions about climate change impacts for departments and divisions responsible for long-term infrastructure planning
- Publication of Preparing for Climate Change: A Guidebook for Local, Regional and State Governments, which is being used to guide and standardize the process of planning for climate change impacts across departments and divisions
- Creation and adoption of the King County Flood Control Zone District, consistent with the King County Flood Hazard Management Plan, to rebuild the regional levee system and consequently protect public health, safety and property from more intense and frequent winter floods that the region is projected to experience in the future
- Participation in regional dialogue about how to prepare for intense storm events
- Research on issues of how climate change will affect already disadvantaged communities in the region
- Active staff participation in the Washington Climate Advisory Team's Preparedness and Adaptation Working Group, especially in the areas of public health and water supply planning, and development of associated recommendations
- Co-sponsorship with the State of Washington on a reclaimed water conference, completion of a reclaimed water feasibility study, and initiation of a Reclaimed Water Comprehensive Plan
- Support of the Puget Sound Partnership, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the international Pacific Salmon Commission on consideration of the impacts of climate change to regional water supply, and continued participation in the Regional Water Supply Planning Process
- Incorporation of climate change impacts and preparedness considerations into the 2008 public review draft of the King County Comprehensive Plan

**Community-wide emissions:** For existing response to reduce King County's regional GHG emissions, please see the Atmosphere section of KingStat's Environmental Indicators.


## Priority New Actions for 2008

### County Operations:

- Refinement of the county's greenhouse gas emissions inventories and SEPA emissions worksheet, as well as continued development of proposed mitigation thresholds for SEPA-reviewed projects
- Launch of a "Green Your Commute" initiative for employees, to increase workplace efficiencies and develop new arrangements in support of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from employee transportation
- Continued collaboration with other governments, universities and the private sector on issues such as greenhouse gas emissions modeling for regional projects, reduction of vehicle miles traveled, encouragement of electrified transportation, broader establishment of fueling infrastructure for clean vehicles, continued development of a regional market for clean vehicles, and improved evaluation of landfill sequestration of greenhouse gas emissions
- Continued work on ways to develop "green collar" jobs in King County government that help meet the county's climate change policy goals
- Development with the Puget Sound Regional Green Fleet Initiative of a "green fleet standard" intended to help guide clean vehicle purchases by municipal governments
- Continued contribution by King County technical and scientific experts to local, regional and state analysis of climate change
- Further institutionalization of climate change mitigation and adaptation planning across county departments, through the Climate Team and its workgroups

**Community-wide emissions:** For priority new actions to reduce King County's regional GHG emissions, please see the Atmosphere section of KingStat's Environmental Indicators.

## Technical Notes

 For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:



- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.



**Updated: December 18, 2008**

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

## KingStat

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Sustainable Resources](#) » Solid/Hazardous Waste Mgt



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS                                       |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES                           |                       |                         |                  |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment  | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services                         | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
| Green Building   Energy Plan   Wastewater Resource Reclamation |                  |                 |                      |            | Climate Protection   Solid/Hazardous Waste Mgt |                       |                         |                  |

### SOLID/HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

2007 Rating:

#### Solid Waste Division (SWD)

Percent of single-family curbside solid waste stream that is recycled.

**2007 Results:** 54%.

**2007 Target:** 54%.


**2008 Target:** 55%.

**Influencing Factors:** in 2007, the King County Solid Waste Division worked closely with cities and haulers to increase the availability of food waste recycling services. The Division also continued the "Recycle More. It's Easy to Do." media campaign which resulted in increased participation in recycling programs.

**Strategy Going Forward:** These efforts will continue in 2008.

**Technical Notes:** The data is countywide except for: a) the cities of Seattle and Milton, which are not in the King County solid waste system; and b) Vashon Island, Snoqualmie Pass and the Skykomish area, which are not included in King County Code recycling service level requirements.

#### Solid and Hazardous Waste Management



- Meets or exceeds target
- Approaches target
- Needs improvement
- Insufficient data at this time

#### Related Information

Wastemobile and Take-it-Back network stores equity information

What do I do With...?

Solid Waste Recycling

Garage & Yard Sales


Household Online Materials Exchange


Industrial Materials Exchange

Solid Waste Business Services

Hazardous Waste Disposal

#### Percent of solid waste recycled for single family households





### Pounds of solid waste disposed per single-family household per week.

**2007 Results:** 27 pounds per week.


**2007 Target:** 27 pounds per week.


**2008 Target:** 26 pounds per week.

**Influencing Factors:** In 2007, the King County Solid Waste Division worked closely with cities and haulers to increase the availability of food waste recycling services. The Division also continued the "Recycle More. It's Easy to Do." media campaign which resulted in increased participation in recycling programs.

**Strategy Going Forward:** These efforts will continue in 2008.

**Technical Notes:** The data is countywide except for: a) the cities of Seattle and Milton, which are not in the King County solid waste system; and b) Vashon Island, Snoqualmie Pass and the Skykomish area, which are not included in King County Code recycling service level requirements.





#### Pounds of Solid Waste Collected per Single Family Household per Week by Collection Area

2007 Information

*Click to download the PDF version.*

### Residents' recycling and disposal behavior via EBI

**About this measure:** The King County Environmental Behavior Index (EBI) tracks and reports on the adoption of selected environmental behaviors of King County residents. In 2004 and again in 2006, 1000 randomly selected respondents in King County participated in a telephone survey and reported on their household's behaviors related to:

- Yard Care
- Recycling And Disposal
- Environmentally Friendly Purchasing

Understanding residents' awareness and behavior guides a more cost-effective targeting of outreach efforts and helps evaluate whether the efforts to improve these behaviors are making a difference.

The 2006 Environmental Behavior Index was conducted in spring of 2006. The findings about yard care and purchasing behavior can be found under the performance measure on solid and hazardous waste management, which is [here](#).


Below are details on findings for residential recycling and disposal behaviors.

**2006 results:** The 2006 survey of residents' recycling and disposal behaviors indicates that use of recycle containers at home is high and improving, as is proper disposal of paints, kitchen grease and prescription drugs. Proper disposal of compact fluorescent light and tubes is low and is slightly declining.

**Influencing factors:** In 2006, the Seattle City Council passed an ordinance making it illegal and punishable by fine to put selected recyclables in the garbage. There was significant media coverage of this new legislation, which likely influenced both awareness and behavior of residents throughout King County.

**Strategy going forward:** SWD will continue to work with cities to allow food waste recycling with yard debris. The SWD is partnering on a recycling education campaign, "Recycle More, Its Easy to Do" and is making further improvements to its Web site about general and food waste recycling.


**Proper disposal of compact  
fluorescents and tubes**



**Residents:**

- Always do
- Don't do
- Sometimes do
- Are unaware of
- Are considering


**Proper use of recycling  
container at home**



**Residents:**

- Always do
- Don't do
- Sometimes do
- Are unaware of
- Are considering


**Proper disposal of  
prescription drugs**



**Residents:**

- Always do
- Don't do
- Sometimes do
- Are unaware of
- Are considering


**Proper disposal of food waste**



**Residents:**


- Always do
- Don't do
- Sometimes do
- Are unaware of
- Are considering

**Proper disposal of  
unwanted electronics**



**Residents:**

- Always do
- Don't do
- Sometimes do
- Are unaware of
- Are considering



## Seattle - King County Local Hazardous Waste Program

**About this measure:** This measure is a composite index of actions aimed at reducing exposure to hazardous materials. Below are descriptions and ratings of 5 key 2007 program areas of the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program and a rating of the degree that targets for these actions were met.

### Waste pharmaceuticals project

Full implementation of the largest pilot unused medicine collection project in the United States.

**Chart:** # collection sites in WA on y axis, years ('06, '07, '08) on x axis (target revised to 30 total sites)

**2006 results:** 7 sites

**2007 results:** 25 sites

**2008 target:** 30

**2007 results:** Green. 25 Group Health Cooperative sites collecting waste medicines

**Influencing factors:** As a pilot project, new hurdles keep appearing. All clinical pharmacies in the Group Health system are finally operational after clearing many logistical hurdles. A few Bartell Drugs' retail pharmacies are next to roll out in '08.

**Strategy going forward:** Pilot project to wrap up in late '08 after testing a pharmacy take-back model. Having a few Bartell Drugs' sites will help to fully test this approach in addition to the Group Health sites. We will push for drug manufacturers and retailers to take over the long-term collection of unused medicines via a product stewardship system.

### Nail salon English-as-a-second language business project

The purpose of this project is to work with nail salon workers for whom English is a second language to reduce exposure to hazardous chemicals.

**2007 results:** Green. Developed "healthy nail salon" guidelines in collaboration with the Environmental Coalition of South Seattle, Community Coalition for Environmental Justice, U.S. EPA and other partners. Tram Duong, ECOSS partner, visited 19 salons, four beauty schools and three nail supply distributors.

**Influencing factors:** Many connections made with the nail salon industry and with Vietnamese-American community to build trust, research concerns, and develop safer alternative products and

practices. Working with local NGO partners helps reach an audience skeptical of working directly with government.

**Strategy going forward:** Continue outreach to salons where Vietnamese-Americans are owners or predominant workers. Increase level of contacts and reach within this community. Achieve 50 salons implementing the suggested best management practices in '08 and 87 implementing best practices in '09.

### Healthy schools project

The focus of this project is to reduce or eliminate exposures to key hazardous chemicals in all King County schools

**2007 results:** Yellow. 55 school inspections were completed, looking for mercury, lead glazes and high risk chemicals. Elemental mercury continued to be found in schools, and was removed. Explosive old chemicals such as crystallized ethyl ether were also uncovered and safely removed.

**Influencing factors:** We had hoped that we could rely on past inspections done through the Rehab the Lab project to assure that schools were, for example, mercury-free, but have found instead that pockets of old products continue to turn up. In addition to science lab supplies, our focus is turning to art supplies, where lead ceramic glazes, hexane-acetone glues and other high hazards are common.

**Strategy going forward:** Keep working with individual schools, school districts and the state Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Develop high risk chemicals ratings and lists that can be disseminated by the state to influence all schools across Washington. Target for '08: 100 schools provides with guidance and incentives for removal and proper disposal of mercury and high hazard art chemicals.

### Low-income governmental housing

The aim of this project is to reduce exposures to key hazardous chemicals found in public housing within King County.

**2007 results:** Yellow. Developed signed agreements with two out of three public housing authorities to eliminate and properly dispose of all mercury-containing thermostats as well as implement some pesticide-reduction strategies.

**Influencing factors:** Local housing authorities are stretched thin, yet are interested in working with us on a variety of hazardous chemical reduction strategies, both in their facilities and landscapes and in getting useful information directly to their residents.

**Strategy going forward:** Continue work with housing authorities, looking for avenues where our services best match their needs. In addition to mercury-reduction through fluorescent lamp recycling and thermostat change-outs, we will focus on integrated pest management techniques in '08 to explore ways to reduce pesticide use.

### Flood hazard zones

This project aims to prevent the release of hazardous chemicals in the event of major river flooding in King County.

**2007 results:** Yellow. Completed 10 site visits of potential problem areas in the Snoqualmie Valley; gathered best management practice guidelines for storage and use of hazardous materials in flood zones from federal and other sources.

**Influencing factors:** Each flood zone valley within King County has a different mix of issues, from predominantly agricultural in the Snoqualmie to commercial and industrial developments in the Green. No one size fits all in terms of best management practices or outreach mechanisms.

**Strategy going forward:** We will continue to explore the best approaches to hazardous material storage concerns in areas subject to major river flooding and to work with those agencies, local governments and businesses who know flood-related issues the best.

**2007 target:** Draft best management practices for.

---

**Pounds of solid waste disposed per employee per week countywide.**



**2007 Results:** 2007 data not available until September 2008.

**2006 Results:** 25.6 pounds per week.


**2007 Target:** 23.5 pounds per week.

**2008 Target:** 23.5 pounds per week.

**Influencing Factors:** A growing economy in 2006 resulted in an increase in the number of employees in the county, but since the growth was in the less waste-intensive service industries, the average pounds per week per employee was reduced in 2006.

**Strategy Going Forward:** The strategy for 2007 is for SWD to work with cities to increase recycling services in the non-residential sector.

**Technical Notes:** The data is countywide except for: a) the cities of Seattle and Milton, which are not in the King County solid waste system; and b) Vashon Island, Snoqualmie Pass, and the Skykomish area, which are not included in King County Code recycling service level requirements.



## Technical Notes

 For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County





King County  
Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

**SEARCH**  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » Productive Partnerships



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                      |                       | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                             |                         |                             |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere            | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources       | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service            |
| Residents Stewardship    |                  | Volunteerism    |                      | Customer Satisfaction |                        | Recreation via Partnerships |                         | Jurisdictional Partnerships |

### PRODUCTIVE PARTNERSHIPS

2007 Rating:

This roll-up measure summarizes the degree DNRP is achieving its **Productive Partnerships goal**:

*Collaborate with partners throughout the region to achieve improved environmental and community outcomes.*

#### 2007 results

DNRP's rating for the performance measures that support this goal is a yellow — signifying results are within 10 percent of target.

Areas under this goal where DNRP performed well:

- Recreation Service Delivery via Community Partnerships

Areas under this goal where DNRP performance approaches target:

- Jurisdictional Relationships
- Customer Satisfaction
- Volunteering
- Residents' stewardship levels.

#### Key influencing factors

Because DNRP is only one of many entities with influence over King County's environmental quality, collaborating with partners is essential to the department's mission. Additional city incorporations and annexations are elevating the role


- [Jurisdictional Partnerships](#)
- [Recreation via Partnerships](#)
- [Customer Satisfaction](#)
- [Volunteerism](#)
- [Residents Stewardship](#)

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

#### Goal 3 Productive Partnerships



- Meets or exceeds target
- Approaches target
- Needs improvement
- Insufficient data at this time

#### Related Information

[Natural Resource Lands](#)  
[Greenprint](#)  
[Water and Land Resources Division](#)  
[King County Parks & Recreation](#)  
[Interactive Parks Map](#)

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.



Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Productive Partnerships](#) » Residents Stewardship



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                       |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES        |                       |                             |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption  | Atmosphere | Environmental Services      | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships     | Price of Service |
| Residents Stewardship    |                  | Volunteerism    | Customer Satisfaction |            | Recreation via Partnerships |                       | Jurisdictional Partnerships |                  |

### RESIDENTS STEWARDSHIP

**About this measure:** The King County Environmental Behavior Index (EBI) tracks and reports on the adoption of selected environmental behaviors of King County residents. In 2004 and again in 2006, 1000 randomly selected respondents in King County participated in a telephone survey and reported on their household's behaviors related to:

- Yard Care
- Recycling And Disposal
- Environmentally Friendly Purchasing


Understanding residents' awareness and behavior guides a more cost-effective targeting of outreach efforts and helps evaluate whether the efforts to improve these behaviors are making a difference.

The 2006 Environmental Behavior Index was conducted in spring of 2006. The findings about recycling and disposal information can be found under the performance measure on solid and hazardous waste management, which is [here](#).

Below are details on the findings for the yard care and purchasing areas.

2007 Rating:

Resident Stewardship Levels



- Meets or exceeds target
- Approaches target
- Needs improvement
- Insufficient data at this time

#### Related Information

[Rural Stewardship](#)  
[Forestry Stewardship](#)  
[Farm Stewardship](#)


### Residential Purchasing Behavior

**2006 results:** This year's survey indicates that purchasing of Compact Fluorescent Lightbulbs (CFLs) has climbed since the prior survey in 2004, though choosing less toxic cleaning products and considering the environmental impacts of purchasing decisions was steady or declining against the 2004 survey results.

**Influencing factors:** Many factors affect the purchasing decisions. Cost, product convenience, and availability are all influential. Public awareness about the impacts of these decisions on the health and environment do play an important role.

**Strategy going forward:** King County is advancing efforts to improve purchasing practices in several coordinated ways. The Solid Waste Division is emphasizing public education through the Eco-consumer program and is sponsoring Eco-Deals — a partnership with makers of green products to use coupons and discounts to promote green products.

The King County is also involved nationally, regionally, and locally with product stewardship efforts that require manufacturers to establish product collection programs. The "Take it Back Network" is expanding locations and opportunities to recycle fluorescent bulbs, electronics and other products.




## Residential Yard Care

**2006 results:** This year's survey of King County yard care behaviors indicates that residents have relatively "green" and improving behaviors regarding disposal of grass clippings and yard waste and proper treatment of treatment of trees and shrubs for insects/diseases. Yard care behaviors that are not "green" or improving include: Reducing lawn size, proper lawn fertilizing, using compost on lawns/gardens, and restoring or planting native plants vegetation on properties.

**Influencing factors:** Recycling yard waste and changes in pesticide (just not using them) use are fairly easy behaviors to change and improve—and there are many voices, messages and incentives to encouraging such change. Reducing lawns, using the right fertilizer, using compost and restoration with native plants, all involve more complex and costly changes and have fewer supporting messages or region wide programs explaining how to do it.

**Strategy going forward:** Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD) will continue to partner with local cities—adding three to four new cities in 2008—using Natural Yard Care and Naturescaping classes to help folks transition into smaller lawns, use of native plants and proper fertilizing and composting. The new online, "[Northwest Native Plant Landscaping Guide](#)" is promoted in conjunction with the trainings to provide technical assistance to residents, once they are home. A Natural Yard Care Web site created by our Online Solutions group in 2007, should be up and running by 2008. Moreover, the King County TV, Yard Talk show has and will feature more information on these topics.


**Proper watering of lawn**



**Residents:**

Always do Don't do


**Use of compost on lawn or garden**



**Residents:**

Always do Sometimes do Don't do Are unaware of  
Are considering


**Proper disposal of grass clippings and yard waste**



**Residents:**

Always do Don't do


**Reducing lawn size and planting natives**



**Residents:**

Always do Sometimes do Don't do Are unaware of  
Are considering

**Avoiding and reducing invasive plants**



**Residents:**

Always do Sometimes do Don't do Are unaware of  
Are considering



[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County

Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

 **SEARCH**  
☐ Search this section
You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Productive Partnerships](#) » Volunteerism

## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                       |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES        |                       |                             |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption  | Atmosphere | Environmental Services      | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships     | Price of Service |
| Residents Stewardship    |                  | Volunteerism    | Customer Satisfaction |            | Recreation via Partnerships |                       | Jurisdictional Partnerships |                  |

### VOLUNTEERISM

2007 Rating:

#### Parks Division

##### Volunteer hours

**About this measure:** King County Parks works to engage the community, educate park visitors, and provide basic enhancements to the park system and the environment through our volunteer program. In addition to the added resources volunteers bring to park projects, people leave with a greater knowledge and appreciation for the park system. The degree of community involvement with the King County parks and natural lands system is an important measure of how engaged the community is with this vital public asset.

**2007 results:** 50,300 volunteer hours**2007 target:** 70,000**2008 target:** 60,000


**Influencing factors:** The volunteer hours did not increase over 2006 numbers as desired due to both outside influences (such as non-profit and other agencies increasing their volunteer outreach efforts) and internal challenges (such as getting volunteers to report actual hours — a universal dilemma faced by volunteer programs).

A very successful event that engaged a range of volunteer resources was the 'extreme makeover' of White Center Heights Park. Combining Starbuck's financial generosity, the volunteer efforts of individuals, organizations, and schools in the White Center community, and the expertise of University of Washington School of Architectural Design students, a non-descript underutilized 6 acre park was transformed. Now renamed Steve Cox Memorial Park, this park is now vibrant gathering area and enhanced natural area that sees daily use by families and friends as well as weekend group picnics and community events.


Natural areas throughout the park system realized over 2,540 feet of new trail construction and 5,000 feet of finished trail, over 10,600 tree and shrub plantings for native restoration, and almost 290 cubic yards of invasive weed removal.

As usual, United Way's Day of Caring in September was a great day for Parks with over 390 volunteer providing 2,060 hours of tasks including weeding nursery stock, pulling Scot's Broom and other invasives, and working on trails.

#### Volunteerism



#### Parks Volunteer Hours



#### Related Information

[King County Volunteer page](#)[The Dirt: DNRP Calendar of Events](#)[Volunteer at King County Parks](#)[Salmon Watchers Program](#)[Salmon Watcher Program, Training Slideshow](#)[King County Parks Volunteer Program](#)

**Strategy going forward:** We will implement improved methods of tracking and accounting for volunteer hours. The program will continue its efforts to build volunteer recruitment by focusing on key program elements such as improving and increasing volunteer recognition, strengthening existing partnerships with communities and organizations while building new ones, and developing more consistent messaging and advertising.

---

## Solid Waste Division (SWD)

**About This Performance Measure:** This measure represents the number of volunteers trained by the Master Recycler Composter Program each year. The volunteers receive free training in waste prevention, recycling, home composting and alternatives to household hazardous wastes. In return, participants agree to share their knowledge and skills through various community outreach efforts.


**2007 Results:** 24

**2007 Target:** 25

**2008 Target:** 25

**Influencing Factors:** It is unclear why attendance dropped from 31 in 2006, as marketing for the program did not change.

**Strategy Going Forward:** MRC program marketing will be the same for 2008 as it was in 2007 .



---

## Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD)

### Salmon watcher program

**About this measure:** Salmon Watcher is a multi-jurisdictional effort focused at protecting a Pacific Northwest treasure and educating the community in the process. The twelve year old program involves volunteers watching streams for spawning salmon in King and Snohomish Counties. This effort mainly focuses on waters within the Lake Washington Watershed and on Vashon Island.

**Influencing factors:** The Salmon Watcher program is voluntary and new watchers enter the program upon their interest and request. Budget allocations and proactive recruitment of watchers can influence how many and the location of monitoring locations.

**Status:** As of 2007, a total of 429 sites on approximately 145 streams have been watched in the program to date. The number of sites and their locations vary from year to year. For example, in 2007, 134 sites were watched on streams.

**Strategy Going Forward:** Continuing to educate property owners with salmon streams on their property by participating in the program about things they can do to improve aquatic habitats.

## Technical Notes

✚ For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Productive Partnerships](#) » Customer Satisfaction



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                       |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES        |                       |                             |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption  | Atmosphere | Environmental Services      | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships     | Price of Service |
| Residents Stewardship    |                  | Volunteerism    | Customer Satisfaction |            | Recreation via Partnerships |                       | Jurisdictional Partnerships |                  |

### CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

2007 Rating:

**About this measure:** Customer service is a cornerstone of good performance. DNRP uses customer feedback mechanisms to:

- Understand changes in customer preferences, priorities and price sensitivities
- Assess program strengths and weaknesses and perceptions of service levels
- Guide program adjustments based on finding

Many of our larger programs have had customer feedback mechanisms in place for several years. The customer survey findings are used to steer program adjustments and ensure that changes produce the intended results.

For the most part, DNRP divisions have selected specific groups of customers or neighboring business and residents to survey about services and programs. Some of our customer service questionnaires are self-administered and others involve the use of consumer research firms.

Customer Satisfaction



#### Related Information

[About DNRP](#)  
[About SWD](#)  
[About WLR](#)  
[Parks Feedback](#)

### Solid Waste Division (SWD)

#### Transfer station customers

**2007 Results:** There was no transfer station customer satisfaction survey conducted in 2007.

**2006 Results:** 4.69.


**Influencing Factors:** Transfer station customer satisfaction was high due to continued good service at the transfer stations.

**Strategy Going Forward:** The same high level of service continued in 2007.

**Technical Notes:** Surveys are ranked on a five point scale.

**2007 Target:** NA, no survey conducted in 2007.

**2008 Target:** 4.5.



### Wastemobile customers

**About this Performance Measure:** In 2007, the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP) in King County conducted a survey of the users of its household hazardous waste (HHW) collection facilities. Visitors provided information about their satisfaction levels with the current hazardous waste disposal services. Information was gathered at the Program's three fixed facilities (located in North Seattle, South Seattle, and at the Factoria transfer station) and at Wastemobile collection events held in the cities of Issaquah and Kent.


**2007 Results:** 67% of those surveyed rated their household hazardous waste collection experience as excellent.

**2007 Target:** 60% of those surveyed rate their household hazardous waste collection experience as excellent.

**2008 Target:** 4.6 on a 1 — 5 scale

**Influencing Factors:** High satisfaction levels may be attributed to the county providing a consistent presence and services that residents are familiar with.

**Strategy Going Forward:** The LHWMP is currently conducting a service level study to enable the county to enhance or maintain the high level of hazardous waste disposal service provided to King County residents.



### Solid waste education program

**About this Performance Measure:** In 2007, SWD reached 21,500 elementary students through an assembly program and over 20,000 elementary and secondary students through classroom workshops. Teachers find the program and workshops to be highly effective in educating students about how reducing waste and recycling benefit the environment. The question teachers respond to in the survey is whether they think the assembly/workshops "enhance student understanding of resource conservation."

**2007 Results:** 4.48.

**Influencing Factors:** The overall rating fell slightly from 4.6 in 2006 to 4.48 in 2007. This drop could be attributed to an increase in variability of response due to a large increase in the number of surveys returned. Survey collection methods were enhanced in 2007, including the implementation of an on-line survey which teachers find easy to use.

**Strategy Going Forward:** SWD will continue to offer its assembly and workshops to schools, updating content for relevancy to department and division goals as well as to appropriateness to grade level and Washington State grade level expectations.

**Technical Notes:** Surveys are ranked on a five point scale.

**2007 Target:** 4.6.

**2008 Target:** 4.6.



---

## Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD)

### DNRP services and programs

**About this measure:** Over the past decade, the Stormwater Services Section has been collecting customer feedback to track, modify and improve how engineers and technicians treat and respond to customer needs. Customer service survey cards are sent out to residents who have registered drainage complaints with WLRD. The number of responses received correlates with rain events, when more complaints are received.

**2007 results:** 93 percent of customer service questions asked were responded to favorably

**2007 target:** 90 percent of customer service questions asked will be responded to favorably

**2008 target:** 90 percent of customer service questions asked will be responded to favorably

**Influencing factors:** Training and education are offered to staff when performance measures fall below goals. When a survey card records dissatisfaction with a staff member, the issue is discussed with him or her.

**Strategy going forward:** Mid-2007, the division launched an on line customer services survey on its Web site and plans to send customer services surveys to people that have sent email inquiries. Information from this survey will supplement results from the drainage services survey reported here.

---

## Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD)

### Wastewater Treatment Plant Neighbors

**About this measure:** This measure addresses the percent of business and residential neighbors who consider wastewater treatment plants in their area to be a good neighbor.

**2007 results:** 70.25%



**2007 target:**  $\geq 75\%$


**2008 target:**  $> 75\%$

**Influencing factors:** Overall, both wastewater treatment plants, West Point and South Plant, have good relationships with their neighbors. The most common reasons residents and businesses say that King County has been a good neighbor continues to be the lack of noticeable impacts of the treatment plants, considering factors such as visibility of the facilities, odor, truck trips, landscaping, environmental impact and responsiveness to community concerns.

"Bad smell" is the most common negative impact residents experience. Trucking impacts are the second highest concern.

**Strategies going forward:** The top two priorities continue to be exploring new methods of odor control and responding to complaints within 24 hours.

## Technical Notes

 For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Productive Partnerships](#) » Recreation via Partnerships



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                       |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES        |                       |                             |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption  | Atmosphere | Environmental Services      | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships     | Price of Service |
| Residents Stewardship    |                  | Volunteerism    | Customer Satisfaction |            | Recreation via Partnerships |                       | Jurisdictional Partnerships |                  |

### RECREATION SERVICES PROVIDED THROUGH PARTNERSHIPS

2007 Rating: ☐

**About this measure:** This measure looks at the success of King County Parks efforts to expand public recreation opportunities using community—based partnerships. The Community Partnerships and Grants (CPG) Program is the primary tool that Parks uses to develop community—based partnerships. This measure includes the number of public users benefiting from new community—based public recreation development projects and the amount of additional community investment leveraged for construction, operations, and programming.

#### 2007 results:

**Number of users benefiting from structured recreational opportunities provided by community—base partners:**

- 2007 results: 12,100
- 2007 target: 11,000
- 2008 target: 28,500

**Number of users benefiting from non—structured recreational opportunities provided by community—based partners:**


- 2007 — 12,500
- 2007 target: 11,000
- 2008 — 34,300

**Financial match leveraged through community—base partners:**

- 2007 — \$2,200,000
- 2007 target: \$2,000,000
- 2008 target: \$6,150,000

**Influencing factors:** Factors influencing successful community—based partnerships include wherewithal of community—based organizations, flexibility in King County's CPG grant parameters, overall capital investment, availability of land for recreation development, and commitment to the comprehensive King County empowerment of community—based partner organizations.

**Strategy going forward:** Continue making strategic investments via the Community Partnerships and Grants (CPG) Program. Develop long term plan to determine acquisition opportunities that support new community—based recreation development projects.



#### Related Information

Community Partnerships and Grants

Propose a community project

## Technical Notes

✚ For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

## KingStat

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

☐ Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Productive Partnerships](#) » Jurisdictional Partnerships



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                       |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES        |                       |                             |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption  | Atmosphere | Environmental Services      | Sustainable Resources | Productive Partnerships     | Price of Service |
| Residents Stewardship    |                  | Volunteerism    | Customer Satisfaction |            | Recreation via Partnerships |                       | Jurisdictional Partnerships |                  |

### JURISDICTIONAL PARTERSHIPS

#### Solid Waste Division (SWD)

Number of cities that participate in the Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC)

**About this measure:** This committee advises the DNRP Solid Waste Division on key regional issues

**2007 Results:** 18

**2007 Target:** 18

**2008 Target:** 19

**Influencing Factors:** Cities are participating because there are important issues being discussed, including an update to the 2001 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan.

**Strategy Going Forward:** The Division will continue to collaborate with MSWMAC in 2008 as it works through the development of the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan.

**Technical Notes:** MSWMAC was created to advise the Executive, the Solid Waste Interlocal Forum and the King County Council in all matters relating to solid waste management and to participate in development of the transfer and waste export system plan.

2007 Rating:



#### Related Information

Salmon Recovery

IRAC - Interagency Resource for Achieving Cooperation

Join IRAC

Puget Sound Fresh

Groundwater Protection

Become a Parks Partner

Northwest Natural Yard Days

Groundwater home page


The Groundwater Story

Map of Groundwater Management Areas

Information about King County's Groundwater Management Areas

WRIA information

MSWMAC City Participation



### Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD)

#### Organizational Partnerships

Number of Signers/Partners to Inter-local Agreements

**About this measure:** This measure tracks the percentage of partners that have signed inter-local agreements with King County for salmon recovery plan implementation and groundwater services. Partners that sign inter-local agreements for salmon recovery plan implementation are organized around state defined geographical areas called Watershed Resource Inventory Areas or WRIA's. In addition to other jurisdictions and tribes the Army Corps of Engineers is included in the potential number of WRIA partners. Partners that sign inter-local agreements for groundwater services do so in only two of the five Groundwater Management Areas in King County — the Redmond-Bear and Issaquah Creek Basins.

**Status:** As of 2007, 49 of a potential 53 partners signed inter-local agreements with King County.

**Target:** The target going forward is to retain all 49 partners.

**Influencing factors:** King County's reputation as a service provider and partner in delivering services is crucial toward the success of this measure. Other jurisdictions, agencies and Indian Tribes are less likely to sign agreements to work with the county if it cannot deliver the services it has agreed to.

**Strategy going forward:** Ensure that agreements signed by King County are funded and implemented.

---

## Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD)

### Local Jurisdiction Partnerships

#### F4 WTD contract extensions

**About this measure:** This measure tracks the degree that local cities and sewer agencies have signed on to contract extensions with the Wastewater Treatment Division.

**2007 results:** 7 signed as of end of 2007

**2007 target:** 33 contracts

**2008 target:** 33 contracts


#### Influencing factors:

- Seattle (42% of ratepayer base) wants greater contractual guarantees regarding growth paying for growth
- Some local agencies want greater role in wastewater capital program decision making

#### Strategies going forward:

- Continue negotiations with Seattle
- Continue to pursue extensions and amendments with individual agencies, primarily suburban cities, who are receptive to county's proposal

## Technical Notes

 For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » Price of Service



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                         |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources   | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
|                          |                  |                 |                      |            | Employees              | Entrepreneurial Revenue | Rates and Fees          | Efficiency       |

### PRICE OF SERVICE

2007 Rating:

This roll-up measure summarizes the degree DNRP is achieving its **Price of Service goal**:

*Be efficient, effective and fiscally responsible to ensure ratepayer value.*

#### 2007 results

DNRP's rating for the performance measures that support this goal is a yellow — signifying results are within 10 of target.

Areas under this goal where DNRP performed well:

- Entrepreneurial and Enterprise revenue.

Areas under this goal where DNRP performance approaches target:

- Rates and Fees
- Efficiency
- Employee Work Practices and Safety

Goal 4 Price of Service



- Meets or exceeds target
- Approaches target
- Needs improvement
- Insufficient data at this time

#### Related Information

- [About DNRP](#)
- [DNRP Annual Report](#)
- [GIS Center](#)
- [About SWD](#)
- [About WLR](#)
- [Parks Business Plan](#)

### Key influencing factors

Since 2002, the Parks Division has been empowered to engage in "good-government" initiatives and embrace non-traditional ways of doing business. This transformation from a centrally funded service provider to an entrepreneurial, performance-driven organization has help ensure that parks serve to enhance communities and the region's high quality of life, even during tight fiscal times.

The Wastewater Treatment Division has developed a productivity initiative pilot program, a joint labor and management effort within the division that could save ratepayers as much as \$67 million over 10 years. The pilot program allows employee flexibility to apply some business practices used in private industry to cut operating costs, increase productivity and continue a high level of service and environmental protection for county residents.

The Solid Waste Division has evaluated a range of options to increase efficiencies in support of stable rates. Transfer stations have been reconfigured to reduce staffing requirements, while outreach and partnership efforts have led to higher levels of residential recycling and lower residential solid waste volumes.

### Strategies going forward

All DNRP divisions will continue to explore and implement opportunities to increase operational efficiencies. Capital investments are being made with an eye toward energy efficiency and reducing operations and maintenance costs.



The Wastewater Treatment Division has expanded its pilot productivity initiative to include capital projects. The Solid Waste Division has plans to reduce contracting costs by bringing recyclable materials hauling in-house, while the Parks Division will continue building partnerships to enhance revenue generation and reduce operation and maintenance costs.

DNRP is enhancing training efforts to further build workforce capacity.

More information about King County's Efficiency, Rates and Fees, Employees, and Entrepreneurial Revenue is available by continuing to the pages for these measures:

- [Efficiency](#)
- [Rates and Fees](#)
- [Employees](#)
- [Entrepreneurial Revenue](#)

[Back to top](#)

---

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

**Updated: December 18, 2008**

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

KING COUNTY HOME | NEWS | SERVICES | DIRECTORY | CONTACT

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

**SEARCH**  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Price of Service](#) » Employees



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                         |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources   | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
|                          |                  |                 |                      |            | Employees              | Entrepreneurial Revenue | Rates and Fees          | Efficiency       |

### EMPLOYEES

2007 Rating:

**About these measures:** These measures look at the degree that targets are met for employee survey results and safety factors. The survey ratings detail trends in employee views on workplace practices, effectiveness, accountability, resource management and satisfaction. Employee accidents and lost time information are tracked by Human Resource personnel and help inform priorities for procedure and equipment improvements as well as training and safety education.

#### Ratings from 2006 employee survey

**Satisfaction Index:** 3.62 on a 1-5 scale, 5 as best

**Workplace Practices Index:** 3.21

**Availability of Resources Index:** 3.62

**Role of Employee Index:** 4.08

#### 2008 employee rating targets

**Satisfaction Index:** 3.75 on a 1-5 scale, 5 as best

**Workplace Practices Index:** 3.5

**Availability of Resources Index:** 3.75

**Role of Employee Index:** 4.2

Most ratings were similar to prior years, although employees rated the following statements more favorably in 2006 than in the 2004 survey:

"Employee are held accountable for their performance at work," and

"Overall, I'm satisfied with the level of involvement I have in decisions that affect my work."

**Influencing factors:** Overall, the ratings of DNRP employees on these survey questions have remained steady since the survey was first conducted in 2000. The slight increase in ratings for the accountability question is likely a result of an increased focus on supervisory responsibilities and addressing employee performance and behavior. Improvements in supervisory skills, labor relations and perceptions of fairness have likely contributed to the improved rating on the job satisfaction question.

**Strategy going forward:** DNRP's Human Resource work plans continue to focus on strengthening performance management, accountability, supervisory development and collaborative relationship with unions. This focus was developed in response to the concerns and perceptions expressed through prior employee surveys.

#### 2007 employee safety results

**2007 results:** Total incidents with injuries: 144



#### Related Information

[About DNRP](#)

[DNRP Annual Report](#)

[GIS Center](#)

[About SWD](#)

[About WLR](#)

[Parks Business Plan](#)

**Average days lost per injury: 13.2**

**2007 targets:** Total incidents with injuries to fewer than 175

**Average days lost per injury: 16**

**Influencing factors:** 2007 was a very positive year for accident and injury reduction. We are seeing positive trends in measurable areas of health and safety, in large part due to investments in safety education, training and process improvements.

DNRP has almost 1,800 regular employees, many of whom perform challenging tasks, including operating and maintaining complex infrastructure systems that run continuously, such as wastewater treatment plants and a wide variety of heavy machinery. Employees also respond to floods, chemical spills and illegal dumping, while monitoring conditions in deep woods, fast-flowing rivers, high peaks and in Puget Sound.



The decline in lost days due to injuries can be in part attributed to increasing light duty assignments for injured employees, procedure and equipment improvements, and increased safety ethic among field employees.

The aging of DNRP's workforce also affects future workplace accidents and injuries; as employees age, many of the physically demanding jobs create the likelihood of work-related injuries and chronic conditions.

**Strategy going forward:** DNRP will continue to foster a safety ethic and make safety training a high priority. Emphasis will be placed on training related to safe procedures when performing tasks that lead to slip/trip hazards, or can create repetitive stress injuries. The King County Healthy Incentives program is instrumental in promoting a healthy lifestyle, which translates to employees who are more capable of performing physically demanding jobs.

At the line operation level, we will advance our comprehensive approach to safety, with the following 5 focus areas:

1. **Build visible safety** by addressing safety issues as they arise, in planning, new equipment selection, project management.
2. **Act on the three P's:**
  - a. Preparation (and planning)
  - b. Processes (policy and procedures, task lists, check lists)
  - c. Prevention (identifying and correcting hazards before they become incidents).
3. **Correct unsafe behavior** when it happens
4. **Correct unsafe conditions** and known hazards quickly
5. **Review all accidents** with long-term elimination of accidents in mind.



We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.



**Updated: December 18, 2008**

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

☐ Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Price of Service](#) » Entrepreneurial Revenue

## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE



| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                         |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources   | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
|                          |                  |                 |                      |            | Employees              | Entrepreneurial Revenue | Rates and Fees          | Efficiency       |

### ENTREPRENEURIAL REVENUE

2007 Rating:

**About this measure:** Since 2002 Parks has been empowered to engage in 'good-government' initiatives and embrace non-traditional ways of doing business. This transformation from a centrally funded service provider to an entrepreneurial, performance-driven organization ensures that parks serve to enhance communities and our regional quality of life, even during tight fiscal times. This measure tracks the Division's success in reaching its goal as established in the 2003 Parks Business Plan of increasing entrepreneurial revenue 5% each year from an established baseline.

**2007 Results:** \$2,688,106

**2007 Target:** \$2,300,000

**2008 Target:** \$2,415,000

**Influencing factors:** Parks team secured two major corporate sponsorships of more than \$650K from Starbucks (\$250K) and Cirque de Soleil (~ \$400k)

**Strategy going forward:** Parks will continue to implement its revenue enhancement strategic plan which positions King County Parks as an advertising partner, program and event facilitator, and entrepreneur. Parks staff will pursue revenue-generating opportunities by continuing to meet with and coordinate revenue based proposals with corporate entities; continuing exploratory meetings with media partners for event and program promotion, sponsorship and revenue based initiatives. In addition, Parks staff will issue an annual Request for Ideas & Proposals to generate new profit centers and lines of business for the division.

#### Enterprise and Entrepreneurial Revenue




Parks Division Achievements


- Meets or exceeds target
- Approaches target
- Needs improvement
- Insufficient data at this time

#### Related Information


[Parks & Recreation Partnerships](#)  
[GIS Center Data Sales](#)



■ Enterprise/  
Entrepreneurial Revenue Actuals  
-- E/E Goal (5% increase)



■ User Fees  
■ Enterprise & Entrepreneurial  
■ Combined  
--- 5% goal



■ User Fees  
-- User Fee Goal (5% increase)

### Technical Notes

⊕ For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.  
[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Price of Service](#) » Rates and Fees



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                         |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources   | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
|                          |                  |                 |                      |            | Employees              | Entrepreneurial Revenue | Rates and Fees          | Efficiency       |

### RATES AND FEES

**About this measure:** DNRP seeks for minimize rates and fees while maximizing value of service. Major programs track rates and fee against the level of inflation and benchmark against similar service providers. For inflation, we look at changes in the consumer price index over a 10 year time horizon.

Because benchmarking against similar service providers and jurisdictions is time intensive, this is done only every other year for most of our programs. Comparative programs are selected for proximity, range of services, and relative cost of doing business.

#### Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD)

#### Monthly residential wastewater service fee increases vs. Consumer Price Index increases

**2007 Wastewater Rate:** \$27.95

**2007 Target:** rate if it had risen by rate of inflation from the 1997 rate: \$26.15

**Difference:** 6.43 percent

**Influencing factors:** WTD is in a period of major construction activity as it invests in future service, including construction of the Brightwater treatment plant and its conveyance system.

**Strategy going forward:** WTD has been implementing a productivity initiative to reduce operating costs and reduce future rate pressure. The rate will be held at \$27.95 for 2007 and 2008.


#### Rate vs. comparable agencies

Rate comparisons provide qualitative information. There are no targets established for this measure. Wastewater service rate in 2005 was greater than average fees from other jurisdictions.

There are significant differences among these utilities in the extent and level of services they provide. For example, some may not provide full secondary treatment or recycle biosolids as extensively as King County does. Additionally, the division is in a period of major construction activity as it invests in future service, including construction of the Brightwater treatment plant and its conveyance system.

WTD has implemented a productivity initiative program aimed at reducing operating costs and increasing savings to ratepayers. The productivity initiative allows employee flexibility to apply business practices used in private industry to cut operating costs, increase productivity, and continue a high level of service and environmental protection for county residents. A joint effort supported by labor, management and employees, the program has saved ratepayers \$33 million in five years.

2007 Rating:




#### Related Information


[About DNRP](#)  
[DNRP Annual Report](#)  
[GIS Center](#)  
[About SWD](#)  
[About WLR](#)  
[Parks Business Plan](#)



**Wastewater Treatment Division  
Monthly Residential Customer  
Equivalent Service Charge  
Compared to Rate of Inflation  
(1997-2007)**



**Average monthly residential  
wastewater service rate**



## Solid Waste Division (SWD)

### Solid Waste Division tip fee compared to rate of inflation

**2007 Results:** The Solid Waste Division tip fee was lower in 2007 than if it had risen at the rate of inflation over the last 10 years.

**2007 Target:** For SWD rates to be lower than if they had risen at the rate of inflation over the last 10 years.

**2008 Target:** For SWD rates to be lower than if they had risen at the rate of inflation over the last 10 years.

**Influencing Factors:** The rate remained unchanged due to modest technical enhancements, improvements in staff scheduling, somewhat greater automation, and the continued upgrading of staff skills.

**Strategy Going Forward:** In 2007 it was clear that inflationary pressures over the last nine years were having an effect that could no longer be offset by internal efficiencies. In addition, the King County Council approved the Division's plan to modernize and expand the transfer station system and the additional costs of this program would begin to be felt starting in 2008. Therefore in 2007 the Council agreed to a rate increase for three years: 2008 through 2010. The new rates took effect on January 1, 2008. The basic fee rose from \$82.50 per ton to \$95.00 per ton.

### Comparison of fees and rates with other agencies that provide comparable services



**2007 Results:** As of March, 2007, the King County solid waste tip fee of \$82.50 per ton was below the mean (\$96.95) and the median (\$98.36) of the tip fees of seven comparable jurisdictions (including King County).

**2007 Target:** For the solid waste tip fee to continue to be below the mean and the median of other, comparable jurisdictions.

**2008 Target:** For the solid waste tip fee to continue to be below the mean and the median of other, comparable jurisdictions.

**Influencing Factors:** SWD rates stayed constant and other jurisdiction's rates either stayed the same as 2006 or went up slightly.

**Strategy Going Forward:** Solid waste tip fees were not raised in 2007 but were raised to \$95.00 per ton as of January 1, 2008.



## Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD)

### Comparison of surface water management fees with inflation

**About this measure:** This measure tracks compares surface water management fees compared to inflation rates over the last 10 years.

**2007 Results:** Last year, the King County Council approved an increase to the surface water management fee, bringing up the annual charge to \$111 per residential parcel. The increase raises revenue to compensate for the eroding effects of inflation. Since 2002, inflation based on CPI has increased by an estimated 15%. King County Office of Management and Budget projections suggest that inflation will rise by another 4.9% through 2009.

**2007 target:** Increase surface water management fees at a rate commensurate or no more than inflation

**Influencing factors:** Many factors drive the level of rates and fees, including storm events that induce flooding and other natural disasters, changes in the economy, additional development, demands for natural resource management services, increased regulatory requirements and changes to the rate base.

**Strategy going forward:** Surface Water Management Fees were raised in 2007 to meet impacts of inflation however regulatory costs related to compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit are increasing while Surface Water Fee revenue is decreasing due to annexations and incorporations. Making surface water activities more efficient while prioritizing how surface water revenues are spent will be important tasks for the Water and Land Resources Division over the next several years.


P-12 Surface water rate vs. comparable agencies

**2007 Results:** King County's surface water management fees are less than both the average and the median of what other incorporated, cities and towns, in King County charge.


**Influencing factors:** King County offers one of the most robust surface water management programs in the region. As a large jurisdiction it is governed by Phase I of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit by the State Department of Ecology to comply with the federal, Clean Water Act. Permit requirements this and for the next six years are more stringent as the state is grappling with declines in the health of its surface waters and the Puget Sound.

**Strategy going forward:** Much work is being done to determine how to comply with regulatory requirements amidst dramatic declines in revenue. Stormwater services will look to making its operations more efficient and King County managers, the Executive and the Metropolitan King County Council will be faced with finding alternative funding sources or eliminating programs previously funded by the surface water management revenues.

### Water and Land Resources Division Surface Water Management (SWM) Fee compared to rate of inflation



### Single family stormwater rate



## Technical Notes

[+](#) For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County



King County  
Always at your service

[KING COUNTY HOME](#) | [NEWS](#) | [SERVICES](#) | [DIRECTORY](#) | [CONTACT](#)

**KingStat**

Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)

[SEARCH](#)  
Search this section

You're in: [KingStat](#) » [2007 KingStat](#) » [Performance Measures](#) » [Price of Service](#) » Efficiency



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES - 2007 ARCHIVE

| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS |                  |                 |                      |            | PERFORMANCE MEASURES   |                         |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Aquatic Environment      | Land & Resources | Health & Safety | Resource Consumption | Atmosphere | Environmental Services | Sustainable Resources   | Productive Partnerships | Price of Service |
|                          |                  |                 |                      |            | Employees              | Entrepreneurial Revenue | Rates and Fees          | Efficiency       |

### EFFICIENCY

#### Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD)

##### Cost per pound of Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) and Total Suspended Solids (TSS) removed

**About this performance measure:** WTD measures efficiency in terms of operating costs per pound of Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) and Total Suspended Solids (TSS) removed during the treatment process. BOD and TSS are the primary pollutants that the treatment process is designed to remove, and these pollutants are directly monitored in the plants' water quality permits.

**2007 Results:** \$0.3152


**2007 Target:** (adjusted for inflation) = \$0.3383

**Influencing factors:** Steps taken through the productivity initiative have helped WTD achieve operational efficiencies represented by this measure.

**Strategy going forward:** WTD will continue to seek reductions in operating costs through its productivity initiative while maintaining high quality standards and service delivery.

2007 Rating:

#### Efficiencies



- Meets or exceeds target
- Approaches target
- Needs improvement
- Insufficient data at this time

#### Related Information

[About DNRP](#)  
[DNRP Annual Report](#)  
[GIS Center](#)  
[About SWD](#)  
[About WLR](#)  
[Parks Business Plan](#)

### Solid Waste Division (SWD)

#### Transfer station operating costs per ton of solid waste.

**About This Performance Measure:** This measure represents the total operating costs of the Solid Waste Division's 10 geographically dispersed transfer facilities (eight transfer stations and two drop boxes) per ton of solid waste disposed.

**2007 Results:** \$12.98


**2007 Target:** \$11.10

**2008 Target:** \$12.39

**Influencing Factors:** In 2007 the Division experienced an increase in costs for 'regular salaried personnel,' resulting from the settlement of several outstanding labor negotiations. Also relevant is a one half of one percent reduction in transfer station tons between 2006 and 2007, making the cost per ton figure slightly larger than expected.

**Strategy Going Forward:** Management will continue to operate in the most efficient manner to control operating costs, including labor, wherever possible, while assuring the safety of both employees and customers at the transfer stations.

**Technical Notes:** SWD's operating costs include labor costs for transfer station facility staffing (Transfer Station Operators and Scale Operators), utilities, equipment repair and maintenance and equipment replacement. Total operating costs are divided by transfer system tonnage. The cost per ton does not include transport of waste to the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill.



## Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD)

### Efficiency Measures

**About this measure:** Water and Land Resources administers programs funded from over forty different sources, making it impossible to quantify a single all-encompassing efficiency measure. These two measures address efficiency within two key revenue sources of surface water management and the noxious weeds program.

### Noxious Weeds

**About this measure:** Over the past two years, the Noxious Weeds Program has seen a reduction in the cost per unit area of noxious weed infestations controlled. This is because a larger area of noxious weeds has been kept under control.

Noxious Weed Program expenditures / area of infestations controlled = cost per unit area infestations controlled

**2007 results:** \$13.59 per square foot

**2006 results:** \$10.68 per square foot

**Influencing factors:** Efficiency gains can be explained by increases in voluntary, citizen weed control compliance due in part to program education and outreach activities. Economies of scale contribute because it is cheaper to keep fewer, larger infestations under control than a multitude of smaller ones. In 2004, 3859 infestations covering an area of 6,688,651 square feet were controlled. In 2005, 3772 infestations covering an area of 9,872,000 square feet were controlled. So in 2004, there were fewer infestations covering a smaller area that were more expensive to control than more infestations covering a larger area in 2005.

**Strategy going forward:** The program will continue to look for and control large infestations but expects a fair amount of fluctuation in the efficiency of its control efforts over the next several years. Marketing, education and citizen reports of infestations have much potential to help the program gain efficiencies.

### Hazardous Waste

**About this measure:** The EnviroStars Program is a customer incentive program that recognizes businesses that generate less hazardous waste. This measure provides a cost to the program for each business recognized in the program. Costs used to calculate this efficiency include salary and benefits, administrative, overhead and program costs such as advertising.

EnviroStars Program costs / number of EnviroStars-recognized businesses

**2006 results:** \$499 per Enviro-Star recognized business.

**Influencing factors:** In 2005 the program was able to become more efficient and the per business cost of EnviroStar recognition decreased by \$245 to \$547 per recognized business.

**Strategy going forward:** These efficiency gains are expected to level off, as they were attributed to the program reaching maturity. The Seattle-King County Local Hazardous Waste Management Program has recently conducted a strategic plan and is moving toward a new focus. As a result, this measure could be altered in the coming year to more accurately reflect effectiveness in delivering work in new program areas.

## Surface Water Management

**About this measure:** Maintaining surface water management facilities is one of the primary responsibilities of surface water fees. Costs used to calculate the efficiency of this activity include labor and mowing. Facility maintenance work is performed by King County's Roads Division in the Department of Transportation.

Facility maintenance/mowing costs (WLR & Roads) / number of facilities maintained

**2007 results:** \$1,320 per surface water management facility

**2006 results:** \$1,121 per surface water management facility

**2005 results:** \$1,013 per surface water management facility.

**Influencing factors:** Negotiating labor practices, machine usage and maintenance schedules with the Roads Division at the Department of Transportation has a major influence over the efficiency of facility maintenance.

**Strategy going forward:** This measure does not account for differences in maintenance schedules and demands that vary by facility type, age and design. Discussions will continue as to how a new measure, or series of indexed measures could be developed to provide a more accurate picture of facility maintenance costs and efficiencies.

Resources were redirected this year toward the maintenance of residential facilities in an attempt to reduce the backlog that exists of outstanding maintenance activities.

---

## Parks Division

### Ratio of employees to acres maintained

**About this measure:** This efficiency measure is a ratio of the number of full-time employees in the Resource Section to the total number of park acres maintained by these employees

**2006 results:** 91 FTE's in the Resource Section

Total Acres = 25,694

282 acres per FTE

**2006 target:** 282


**2007 target:** 282

**Influencing factors:** Because staffing levels and land inventory are fairly stable and predictable for the next year, the main influencing factors have to do with the quality and type of maintenance Parks staff are able to perform.


1. Public and employee safety (for example: injury may result if maintenance action not taken);
2. Mandated requirements subject to potential fines if not performed (for example: various required permits, sensitive areas protection, ESA, integrated pest management, drainage maintenance);
3. Scheduled (revenue generating) use of park assets (for example: athletic leagues, picnics, weddings, large special events, revenue would be lost if maintenance action is not taken);
4. High community expectations and visibility projects (for example: East Lake Sammamish Trail, new athletic fields or community centers);
5. Storm damage and other natural event problems to the park system;
6. Preserve and protect projects (for example: roof repairs or field maintenance, if not done,

- further damage occurs); and
7. **Unscheduled public use** (for example: trail use, drop in athletic play, dog-off leash use).

**Strategy going forward:** Under the constraints of the levy that expires at the end of 2007, Parks plans to acquire key properties while maintaining current staffing levels. By increasing volunteer efforts through our programs, such as Park Ambassadors, Adopt-a-Park, and Community Partnership Grants, and continuing our partnerships with agencies, such as the Washington Trails Association and Earthcorps, we hope to continue to improve our existing service levels. Prior to acquisitions, funding to support the annual cost of the land management plan will be identified. This type of pre-acquisition evaluation will avoid costly liabilities, such as environmental hazards (including mine shafts, methamphetamine labs, and noxious weed infestations), and recognize existing inappropriate public uses, which may require costly management.



## Technical Notes

 For definitions and more detail.

[Back to top](#)

We welcome your feedback and suggestions to improve this site, such as:

- Other reliable environmental data sources for King County
- Adjustments to the weightings for indicators and performance measures
- Mistakes to fix

Share your thoughts by sending an e-mail to Richard Gelb, DNRP Performance Measurement Lead, at [richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov](mailto:richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov) so your input can be considered for subsequent updates.

Updated: December 18, 2008

[King County](#) | [News](#) | [Services](#) | [Contact](#) | [Search](#)

Links to external sites do not constitute endorsements by King County. By visiting this and other King County web pages, you expressly agree to be bound by terms and conditions of the site.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2009 King County